DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 450 SO 014 578

AUTHOR	Andreasen, Alan R.; Belk, Russell W.
TITLE	Consumer Response to Arts Offerings: A Study of Theater and Symphony in Four Southern Cities.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Business Administration.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 78
CONTRACT	RQO-22-6N
NOTE	170p.; Some pages may be marginally legible due to broken print type.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Audiences; *Citizen Participation; *Concerts; Interviews; Life Style; Social Attitudes; Social Science Research; Socioeconomic Influences; *Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS	Georgia (Atlanta); Louisiana (Baton Rouge); South Carolina (Columbia); Tennessee (Memphis); *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

In an effort to broaden the audience for the performing arts, attitudinal, life-style, and socioeconomic data on marginal and regular attenders of theater and symphony concerts in Atlanta (Georgia), Baton Rouge (Louisiana), Columbia (South Carolina), and Memphis (Tennessee) were collected. Telephone interviews were conducted with 1491 respondents 14 years of age or older randomly selected from households with telephones in 4 cities. Four major factors were found to predict attendance at both theater and symphony: attitudes toward attendance, attendance in the past year, interest in the art form as a child, and membership in the Culture Patron life-style group. For both theater and symphony, the two highest impact strategies were to offer second tickets at half price from time to time and to include famous performers in the production. The report concludes with recommendations of interest to arts managers who would like to translate the study results into concrete actions and with methodological conclusions of interest to those doing further audience studies. Appendices contain statistical tables, a note on factor analysis, and the survey questionnaire. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED230450

CONSUMER RESPONSE TO ARTS OFFERINGS:

A STUDY OF THEATER AND SYMPHONY

IN FOUR SOUTHERN CITIES

Alan R. Andreasen
Professor of Business Administration
Research Professor, Survey Research Laboratory

Russell W. Belk
Associate Professor of Business Administration

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

September 1978

SP 004 578

Prepared for the Research Division of the National Endowment for the Arts under Contract No. RQO-22-6N.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
SUMMARY	ix
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	3
A. Sample Selection	3
B. Characteristics of the Sample	6
C. The Questionnaire	6
III. FINDINGS	7
A. Past and Future Attendance	7
1. Past Attendance	7
2. Future Attendance: General Findings	9
B. Determinants of Future Attendance	13
1. Past Findings	14
2. Life Style	18
a. Leisure Life-Style Characteristics	20
b. General Life-Style Characteristics	30
3. Attitudes toward Theater and Symphony	32
4. Family Life Cycle	39
5. Regression Results	41
a. Theater	44
b. Symphony	47
c. Nonuseful Potential Predictors	49
6. Implications of the Associational Approach	50
a. Attitudes	50
b. Leisure Life-Style Groups	55
c. Interest in the Arts as a Child	61
7. Deficiencies of the Associational Approach	62
C. The Manipulations Approach	63
1. The Manipulations	64
2. Results	72
a. New Offerings	72
b. Price and Series Strategies	73
c. Broadening the Audience	78
d. Responses to Manipulations across Life-Style Groups	81
e. Responses to Manipulations within Life-Style Groups	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Page

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 88

A. Managerial Conclusions and Recommendations 88
B. Analytical Conclusions and Recommendations 94

APPENDICES

A. Detailed Statistical Tables 96
B. Technical Note on Factor Analysis 98
C. Survey Questionnaire with Frequency Counts 110

REFERENCES 138

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table		Page
1.	Final Sample Size, by City	5
2.	Theater and Symphony Attendance in Past 12 Months	8
3.	Percentage of Respondents Attending Theater and Symphony in Past 12 Months, by City	8
4.	Anticipated Attendance of Theater and Symphony	9
5.	Future Attendance of Theater and Symphony, by Past Attendance	11
6.	Percentage Planning to Attend Theater and Symphony, by Past Attendance	12
7.	Distribution of Respondents by Leisure Life-Style Grouping	21
8.	Expectations about Outcomes of Attending Theater and Importance of These Outcomes, by City	35
9.	Expectations about Outcomes of Attending Symphony and Importance of These Outcomes, by City	36
10.	Simple Correlations of Selected Respondent Characteristics and Likelihood of Attending Theater and Symphony	42
11.	Multiple Correlation Coefficients for Variables Predicting Likelihood of Attending Theater	45
12.	Multiple Correlation Coefficients for Variables Predicting Likelihood of Attending Symphony	48
13.	Expectations about Outcomes of Attending Theater and Symphony, by Past Attendance	52
14.	Importance of Outcomes of Attending Theater and Symphony, by Past Attendance	53
15.	Significant Demographic Differences among Leisure Life-Style Groups	56
16.	Differences in Childhood Exposure to the Arts and Amount of Leisure Time among Leisure Life-Style Groups	57

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES--Continued

Table — Page

17. Differences in Family Life Cycle among Leisure Life-Style Groups 58

18. Differences in General Life Style among Leisure Life-Style Groups 59

19. Indices of Effectiveness for New Symphony Offerings, by Past Attendance 74

20. Indices of Effectiveness for New Theater Offerings, by Past Attendance 75

21. Indices of Effectiveness of Price and Series Strategies, by Past Attendance 76

22. Probability That Responses to New Offerings and Price and Series Strategies of Past Nonattenders and Attenders Are the Same . . 79

23. Percentage Decreasing Planned Future Attendance of Theater, by Price Increase 80

24. Indices of Effectiveness of New Symphony Offerings, by Life-Style Group 82

25. Indices of Effectiveness of New Theater Offerings, by Life-Style Group 83

26. Indices of Effectiveness of Price and Series Strategies, by Life-Style Group 84

27. Significant Probabilities That Responses to New Offerings of Past Nonattenders and Attenders Are the Same within Life-Style Groups 86

A1. Percentage of Final Sample To Meet Screening Criteria 96

A2. Sampling Results, by City 97

B1. Mean Variable Scores (Normalized) for Each Leisure-Specific Life-Style Group 99

B2. Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix: Correlations of Variables with General Life-Style Factors 105

Figure

1. Selected Activities, Interests, and Opinions of Passive Homebody Life-Style Group 22

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES--Continued

Figure

Page

2. Selected Activities, Interests, and Opinions of Active Sports Enthusiast Life-Style Group 23

3. Selected Activities, Interests, and Opinions of Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient Life-Style Group 24

4. Selected Activities, Interests, and Opinions of Culture Patron Life-Style Group 25

5. Selected Activities, Interests, and Opinions of Active Homebody Life-Style Group 26

6. Selected Activities, Interests, and Opinions of Socially Active Life-Style Group 27

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was made possible through the assistance of a great many specialists in the performing arts and in survey research. Insightful suggestions for questions and manipulations to be presented to our survey respondents were offered by Michael Hardy of the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts at the University of Illinois, Harold Horowitz of the National Endowment for the Arts, Hugh Southern of the Theater Development Fund, and Michael Useem of the Center for Study of Public Policy. Assistance with pretesting was provided by Michael Hardy and by Juana H. McCoy of the Memphis Arts Council, Inc. William D. Wells of Needham, Harper and Steers aided in constructing our pool of life-style items. Technical assistance on the survey design and analysis was given generously by Seymour Sudman of the Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois. The latter organization was responsible for managing the field work and for coding and reducing the data for analysis. This work was conducted under the competent supervision of Mati Frankel, Jutta Sebestik, and Dorothy Nemanich of SRL. Field work was carried out by Joyner-Hutcheson Research, Inc., of Atlanta, Georgia. Computation of Q-factor groupings was carried out by Market Facts, Inc., Chicago, under the supervision of John Freehling. Harold Horowitz, Paul DiMaggio, and several anonymous reviewers in the arts community made useful comments on an earlier draft of this report.

Finally, we wish to thank our tireless research assistants, Tony Schellink, Gregory Upah, and Ganesan Visvabharathy for their willingness

to carry out sometimes dull assignments and their ability to give us insights and perspectives on the analyses they were helping produce.

SUMMARY

This study applies recent advances from the field of marketing to attitude measurement, life-style analysis, market segmentation, and multivariate statistics to audience development research. Data were collected from a sample of 1,491 respondents 14 years of age or older in four southern cities (Atlanta, Georgia; Memphis, Tennessee; Columbia, South Carolina; and Baton Rouge, Louisiana). Our focus was on attracting marginal attenders rather than building subscription sales among present attenders. For this reason, potential respondents judged to have zero probabilities of attending resident theater or symphony in the future were eliminated from the study and present heavy users were undersampled.

Somewhat less than half the sample claimed to have attended the theater in the previous 12 months; about the same proportion said that they would attend "in the next year or two." By contrast, 14 percent attended a symphony concert in the past year, but *double* that number said they were likely to attend in the next year or two. A substantial proportion of those who planned to go to both theater and symphony events in the future had *never* been in the past.

Two approaches to the problem of broadening the audience for theater and symphony were then explored. The first approach, called the "associational" approach, considered which characteristics best predicted whether respondents anticipated attending theater and symphony in the future. The second "manipulations" approach explored the responses of potential audiences to new theater and symphony offerings.

To find the best set of predictors of future attendance, the "associational" approach employed stepwise regression analysis using a battery of individual traits including demographic characteristics, prior experience with theater or symphony, a specially developed leisure life-style characterization, measures of general life-style traits, measures of attitudes toward theater or symphony, and a measure of the respondent's stage in the family life cycle. The best predictors of anticipated future attendance for *both* theater and symphony were found to be attitudes toward attending these events, prior experiences with the cultural arts (including childhood interests), and belonging to a leisure life-style group characterized in this report as "Culture Patrons." In addition, for theater the absence of two general life-style traits referred to here as "traditionalism" and "self-confidence/opinion leadership" increased the level of anticipated future attendance beyond that suggested by the predictor variables shared with the symphony analysis.

These findings, although associational, are interpreted to suggest that leisure life styles are a valuable means for characterizing prospective theater and symphony attenders (i.e., for segmenting the market). In addition it appears that early childhood socialization in the arts is critical and that greater likelihood of attendance is reflected in more detailed attitudes toward theater and symphony attendance. Finally, in contrast to most other past studies, purely demographic or family life-cycle characteristics were not found to be the best predictors of attendance. In particular, we did not find significant differences across cities.

The other significant group of analyses conducted, the "manipulations" approach, examined reported *changes* in the likelihood of future theater and symphony attendance if certain changes were made in these offerings

or in the controllable conditions surrounding them. Since the overall objective was to assess the potential for attracting new patrons rather than simply increasing the attendance of current patrons, these analyses compared the responses of current attenders and current nonattenders at each cultural event.

Over a dozen different modifications were considered in four basic areas: (1) changes in the event (type of performance, quality of performance, formality, and extent of learning opportunities); (2) price changes; (3) changes in the event's location; and (4) changes of price in combination with changes in the event or its location.

The analysis of these manipulations clearly pinpointed two strategies that appear to have very high impact on present nonattenders, although in both cases the impact on present attenders is just as great. One can attract more nonattenders by offering second tickets at half price, a strategy that strikingly appears likely to generate *more revenues from nonattenders* than does offering ticket or series discounts of *larger* amounts. A second high impact strategy is one that is not surprising to arts managers--including more famous performers in the event. The next most important overall strategies for attracting symphony attenders were offering tickets at half off on the day of the program and having a short introductory talk before the concert. However, both of the latter strategies appear to have lower overall impact on *theater* nonattenders, who seem more responsive to program changes, especially the offering of more musical comedies.

Several of the proposed strategies also had an impact on past attenders. Investigation of strategies that selectively broadened audiences

(i.e., attracted past nonattenders but not past attenders) found none for theater and only one for symphony--offering choral music. Subsequent analysis within life-style groups showed that choral music was mainly effective on nonattenders among a life-style group described here as "Passive Homebodies." However, increasing the use of choral music is probably not effective because it affects only one life-style group and, more importantly, because it has the lowest overall impact score among nonattenders.

Given the lack of a great number of significant selective strategies for increasing attendance at symphony and theater events, the obvious implication from this analysis for managers is that the major short-term strategy for broadening the audience is to use high-impact strategies such as occasionally offering second tickets at half off or scheduling more famous performers, recognizing that these strategies will also increase patronage among present attenders. Data from the associational analysis would also encourage the use of the second ticket at half off to stimulate interpersonal influence processes, thus getting present attenders to invite nonattenders at the reduced rate.

I. INTRODUCTION

This study responds to three specific objectives of the arts community. A first long-run objective is to broaden the audience for the performing arts. Presently there is a great deal of interest among arts managers in increasing subscription sales to current attenders as a means of stabilizing revenues (18). This is not our focus here. The present research follows from the mandate of the National Endowment for the Arts to "make arts and cultural activities more widely available to millions of Americans" (16, p. 11). To achieve this, the arts must attract greater patronage from current light attenders and, particularly, from nonattenders. However, at this time we know little about why some people become arts attenders and others do not. We know even less about **what**, if anything, can be done to make light or nonattenders attend more often.

The traditional approach to this problem has been to look at relationships between standard socioeconomic characteristics and arts attendance one at a time (e.g., 13, 17, 30). The present study advances **this** approach by adding complex life-style and attitudinal measurements to the standard set of predictors and by simultaneously analyzing the relationships between planned arts attendance and *all* the predictor variables.

However, as we shall discuss below, a problem with this "associational" approach is that association does not imply causation. Inferences about the effects that changes in arts offerings might have on future

attendance are subject to very strong, often fatal, qualifications. Efforts by researchers to look directly at the effects of given changes on attendance have been rare. One such attempt is found in the work of Eric Marder (13).

Marder developed a model of respondents' attitudes toward seven performing arts. He then, in effect, asked the model what would happen if selected beliefs about these arts were changed, deriving estimates of likely gains and losses to each art form. Three limitations exist in Marder's pioneering work, however. First, respondents were not asked directly what their responses to the changes would be. Second, relative choices were forced; a gain for one art form always meant a loss for another. Finally, no assessment was reported of *who* changed. Thus, one cannot tell whether the changes simply attracted more present attenders or, in fact, broadened the arts audience.

To extend Marder's work, the present study asked potential theater and symphony attenders what their responses would be to proposed changes in the offerings of those institutions. Many means of increasing attendance have been tried or suggested in various parts of the country, including price discounts, touring programs, and special promotions (e.g., 2). A major objective of this study is to explore several such changes in order to provide insight into what will and will not broaden the arts audience.

The second broad objective to which this study is directed is the need to apply the sophisticated tools of marketing and business management to the problems of generating demand for the arts. This study introduces several recent marketing approaches to demand analysis in an attempt to give new insights into arts audiences and their development.

In particular, the study makes considerable use of recent advances in attitude measurement, life-style analysis, market segmentation, and multivariate statistics to develop strategies for arts managers.

A final objective is to develop information that can be used by arts administrators in the South, where research (e.g., 17) has shown that demand for the performing arts is particularly weak.

II. METHODOLOGY

In order to achieve the three objectives outlined above, this study develops basic attitudinal, life-style, and socioeconomic data on marginal and regular attenders of two of the performing arts--theater and symphony concerts. The study was carried out in four southern cities (Atlanta, Georgia; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Columbia, South Carolina; and Memphis, Tennessee) and assesses responses to 12 different manipulations in the offerings of both resident symphony and resident theater. The four cities were chosen from among a list of several dozen southern cities with both a symphony and regular theater presentations.

A. Sample Selection

Data for the analysis were gathered by means of telephone interviews conducted with respondents 14 years of age or older randomly selected from households with telephones in the four cities. At the outset, it was decided that a major focus of the study would be on marginal attenders--those who do not now go frequently to theater or symphony but who might be enticed to do so. For this reason, those whom we judged to have virtually zero probability of attending theater or symphony were screened out. At the same time, those who are already heavy attenders were intentionally

undersampled, since our concern was not with appealing to audiences already heavily involved in the arts. The undersampling was accomplished by interviewing only one-half of those who had attended three or more theater or symphony performances in the previous year.

Screening questions defined potential users as the following:

a) Those who did one of the following in the last 12 months:
   (1) Went to live popular or rock concerts;
   (2) Listened at least ten times to classical music on radio, television, records, or tapes;
   (3) Visited an art gallery or museum;
   (4) Went to a live classical music performance other than a symphony concert;
   (5) Saw a ballet either live or on television;
   (6) Saw one or two plays;
   (7) Went to a symphony orchestra concert once or twice.

b) And/or those who met one of the following qualifications:
   (1) Plays a musical instrument;
   (2) Ever worked for a theater, music, or dance production;
   (3) Attended three or more live plays sometime in their lives but not in the past year;
   (4) Attended three or more symphony orchestra concerts sometime in their lives but not in the past year.

A total of 3,956 residential telephone numbers were selected for screening. Of these, 44 percent were not screened because the numbers were no longer in service, the residents were not at home after five callbacks, or they refused to participate. Of those screened, 15 percent

were heavy attenders; by sample design, one-half of them were dropped from the main sample.[1] Only 14 percent of those reached were dropped because their probability of attending was deemed to be zero according to the criteria discussed above. (Percentages of the final sample who met each screening criterion are reported in Appendix A, Table A1.) After screening, a total of 1,733 households were designated for complete interviews. A systematic selection table (see Appendix C) was used to determine the household member to be interviewed. Of the remaining respondents, an additional 14 percent were unavailable or refused to participate in the main interview, yielding a final sample of 1,491, subdivided by city as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

FINAL SAMPLE SIZE, BY CITY

City	Number	Percent
Atlanta	357	23.9
Baton Rouge	358	24.0
Columbia	385	25.8
Memphis	391	26.2
Total	1,491	99.9

Detailed sampling results by city are given in Appendix A, Table A2.

[1]Of the heavy attenders, 77 percent were heavy attenders of theater only, 5 percent were heavy attenders of symphony only, and 14 percent were heavy attenders of both.

B. Characteristics of the Sample

The study's methodology attempted to develop a sample of individuals over 14 years of age in the four metropolitan areas. Comparisons of study characteristics with available census data suggest that the sample population is younger, better educated, from a higher income level, and substantially more often female than the general population of the four areas. These differences are consistent with those found in other studies using telephone interviewing and are also consistent with our procedure for screening out those with zero probability of attending arts events.

C. The Questionnaire

Respondents in the study were asked extensive questions about their attitudes and behavior toward theater and symphony, aspects of their leisure and general life styles, and their socioeconomic characteristics. The questions were developed from other research studies, from introspection, and from several focus-group interviews with heavy and light arts attenders. The questionnaire was pretested with a sample of 30 respondents in Memphis. Because of the length of the questionnaire, one-third of the main sample in each city was asked about their attitudes toward attending the theater, another third was asked about their attitudes toward attending symphony concerts, and the final third was asked neither set of attitude questions. The questionnaire reproduced in Appendix C includes basic frequency counts or mean responses for each question.

III. FINDINGS

As indicated in the Introduction, this study is concerned with building future audiences. It is designed to offer guidance on how to make both past nonattenders and attenders become future attenders. The study utilizes two broad analytical approaches: (1) analyzing associations with planned future attendance (the "associational" approach), and (2) analyzing responses to proposed changes in arts offerings (the "manipulations" approach). Sections B and C of this part of the report are devoted to these analyses. First, however, we shall begin in Section A with a background description of the sample's past and planned future patronage behavior.

A. Past and Future Attendance

1. Past Attendance

About 42 percent of all respondents in the study claimed that they had attended the theater in the past 12 months (and an additional 46 percent had not attended theater in the past year but had attended at least three times in their lives). By contrast, only 14 percent had attended a symphony concert in the past 12 months (and 19 percent had at some previous time). Some 10 percent of the respondents had attended *both* symphony and theater, and some 54 percent had attended *neither* in the past 12 months, as the figures in Table 2 indicate. Clearly those who are concertgoers only are a small, unique group; concert attendance is more likely to be combined with theater attendance. Quite the opposite is true of theater attendance.

TABLE 2

THEATER AND SYMPHONY ATTENDANCE
IN PAST 12 MONTHS

Attendance	Number	Percent
Attended theater only	482	32.3
Attended theater and symphony	148	9.9
Attended symphony only	60	4.0
Attended neither	800	53.7
Total	1,490	99.9 [a]

[a] Not 100 percent because of rounding.

Past attendance at theater is very similar across the four cities in our study, but symphony attendance is not, as the figures in Table 3 indicate. Columbia has much lower concert attendance and Atlanta has somewhat higher concert attendance than the remaining two cities.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS ATTENDING THEATER AND
SYMPHONY IN PAST 12 MONTHS, BY CITY

City	Attending within past 12 months	
	Theater	Symphony
Atlanta	42.0	18.3
Baton Rouge	43.4	14.8
Columbia	44.5	9.1
Memphis	39.4	13.8

Whether these differences are due to differences in the kinds of people in each of these cities or to other factors in their respective cultural environments (e.g., quality and relative availability of performances) is an issue to which we shall return in later multivariate analyses.

2. Future Attendance: General Findings

Despite the fact that respondents to this study were asked about past attendance and about other behaviors that might make them potential attenders at theater and symphony, it was not expected that they would all be likely to attend in the next year or two. Clearly, if a respondent was not very likely to attend, asking him or her about attending more or less often if certain changes were made in theater and symphony offerings was not likely to yield meaningful results. Thus, respondents were further screened on their anticipated likelihood of attending theater or symphony concerts "in the next year or two." The results are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

ANTICIPATED ATTENDANCE OF THEATER AND SYMPHONY

Anticipated attendance	Number	Percent
Very or somewhat likely to attend theater only	316	21.2
Very or somewhat likely to attend theater and symphony	340	22.8
Very or somewhat likely to attend symphony only	89	6.0
Not very or not at all likely to attend either	746	50.0
Total	1,491	100.0

Comparison of these data with those on past attendance indicates that about the same proportion anticipate attending symphony only or neither symphony nor theater in the future as in the past. There is a marked shift, however, from "theater only" to joint theater and symphony attendance. Although this shift does not affect the number who are planning to attend theater, it has marked effects on the number who are planning to attend symphony concerts in the next year or so.

To see where this shift is coming from, past and planned future attendance is contrasted in Table 5. Here we can see that the most stable groups are those who go either to *both* art forms or to *neither*; in each case, about two-thirds say that they will continue their past patterns. The remaining categories have a great deal of volatility. Only 18 percent of the symphony-only patrons and 34 percent of the theater-only patrons claim that they will continue exactly the same arts attendance patterns. Half of the symphony goers say that they will add theater attendance and a quarter of the theater attenders will add symphony. By contrast, one-quarter of the symphony-only attenders and over one-third of the theater-only attenders will drop out of the market altogether.

Put another way, those who attended both theater and symphony appear more likely to remain loyal to each performing art than those who attended only one of the art forms, as the figures in Table 6 show. This high likelihood of future attendance on the part of those with interest in more than one cultural art is a finding that we shall see reflected in later analyses. It will, undoubtedly, not come as a surprise to arts researchers or administrators.

TABLE 5

FUTURE ATTENDANCE OF THEATER AND SYMPHONY,
BY PAST ATTENDANCE[a]

Future attendance	Past attendance									
	Theater only		Theater and symphony		Symphony only		Neither		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Theater only	164	34.1	15	10.2	6	10.0	129	16.1	314	21.1
Theater and symphony	118	24.5	97	66.0	29	48.3	96	12.0	340	22.9
Symphony only	25	5.2	12	8.2	11	18.3	41	5.1	89	6.0
Neither	174	36.2	23	15.6	14	23.3	533	66.7	744	50.0
Total	481	100.0	147	100.0	60	99.9[b]	799	99.9[b]	1,487	100.0

[a]Attendance within past 12 months.

[b]Not 100 percent because of rounding.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE PLANNING TO ATTEND THEATER AND SYMPHONY, BY PAST ATTENDANCE

Past attendance	Future attendance	
	Theater	Symphony
Theater only	58.6	29.7
Theater and Symphony	76.2	74.2
Symphony only	58.3	66.6

We still have not resolved the problem of where the "new" symphony attenders come from. Fully 65 percent of those who say they will go to the symphony in the next year or so did not attend in the past 12 months. On the other hand, only 39 percent of future theater attenders did not attend the past year's theater performances. What is even more surprising is that of these potential "new" symphony attenders, 70 percent have *never* attended three or more concerts in their lives. The comparable figure for theater is only 12 percent. Several explanations of this finding are possible:

(1) Symphony audiences may indeed be growing much faster than theater audiences. (The implied annual growth rate for symphony is 48 percent, compared with 10 percent for theater.) Actual attendance data in the four cities would belie this, suggesting--as seems reasonable--that the "likely" attendance figures are not always very good predictors of actual behavior.

(2) Symphony attendance is seen as more prestigious than theater attendance, so that more respondents tried to impress our interviewers by saying that they planned to attend in the future. Undoubtedly, some of this response bias is present in our data, but to suggest that it applies to 15-19 percent of the sample seems unlikely.

(3) The potential audience for symphony is much larger than past attendance figures would suggest. By saying that they plan to go in the future, past nonattenders may be merely signaling their interest in attending if the circumstances are right. Such a possibility would predict that this group might be particularly responsive to new offerings, a prediction that we shall see has some support.

B. Determinants of Future Attendance

It is future attendance that arts marketers wish to influence. One approach to developing strategies to that end, as we have noted, is to ascertain what characteristics are associated with planned attendance. The assumption, then, is that if one knows that some members of a particular population segment have a high probability of attendance, one should focus one's marketing efforts on that segment with the expectation that nonattenders or light attenders in the segment are more likely to be favorably predisposed to take the action that one wants than are those in other segments. Marketing dollars would therefore be more productively spent with such a sequential strategy (7, 25).

1. Past Findings

There have, of course, been a large and growing number of audience studies conducted in the United States in the last ten years, a great many of which are unpublished.

A detailed analysis of 270 studies of audiences for museums and the performing arts has recently been completed by DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown (5). Through extensive efforts at standardizing the results across these diverse studies, these researchers concluded the following:

Gender: "The percentage of men and women in the audiences surveyed varied, but did not differ greatly from the population at large" (5, p. ii).

Age: "On the average, arts audiences exhibited age profiles similar to that of the entire population, but specific audiences frequently diverged greatly from this central tendency" (5, p. 32).

Educational attainment: "Although audiences varied considerably, median educational attainment was in most cases very high relative to the population at large" (5, p. iii).

Occupation: "Among the most striking findings were the high median percentages of professionals in the audiences surveyed relative to their share of the employed civilian work force and the rarity of blue collar workers among attenders surveyed in art museums and the performing arts" (5, p. iii).

Income: "The median income for performing arts audiences was approximately $19,000 [in mid-1976 dollars], or about $4,000 more than the United States' average" (5, p. iv).

Race and ethnicity: "Minorities participated in the relatively few audiences for which data were available at rates consistently lower than their share of relevant metropolitan populations" (5, p. iv).

In addition to these findings, the authors also reached the following conclusions:

(1) There seem to be no significant changes in audiences over time, although there are relatively few pre-1970 studies.

(2) Heavy attenders reported higher education levels and incomes than did light attenders but they had the same gender and age patterns.

(3) Heavy attenders at one live performing art (except theater) tended to be heavy attenders at other live performing arts.

These findings, in the main, are not very surprising, and in their conclusions, the authors point to the need for further advances in research to try to improve the quality of audience research. They urge four specific advances of relevance to the present study:

(1) They ask, "Is there one arts audience or many? For example, do major arts centers like New York have multiple publics while smaller cities have a single cultural public?" (5, p. 177).

Much of the past research on arts audiences has tended to contrast attenders and nonattenders and has not looked to see if there are meaningful subsegments within either group. A major contribution of the present study is that it divides the population in advance into subsegments based on their leisure-time use patterns and then observes their likelihood of future attendance and their responsiveness to new arts offerings. In addition to developing these leisure life-style groupings, this study also develops a rich array of data on respondents' general life-style tendencies.

(2) DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown state: "Another issue about which little is known and much curiosity exists is the process of socialization into arts attendance: how early does it begin, how important is the family, and how important is the school?" (5, p. 178). The present study for the first time adds to the standard set of socioeconomic variables two new sets of questions asking about (a) the extent to which respondents were interested in classical music or live theater when they were growing up and (b) the extent to which their parents were interested in the same performing arts. In addition to these new questions, the analysis also takes conventional data on age, marital status, and the presence or absence of children to construct a measure of the respondent's stage in the family life cycle to see whether receptivity to the performing arts is higher or lower as one moves through a set of typical life stages.

(3) DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown indicate a critical need for more information on *why* people do or do not attend. For example, they ask, "Do individuals fail to attend museums and the live performing arts because of disinterest, antipathy, inconvenience, prices or discomfort?" (5, p. 176). Clearly, to answer this question one must know the extent to which potential attenders' expectations affect their attendance. To this end, our study has included a substantial battery of questions about consumer attitudes (e.g., their expectations) when attending theater and symphony and on the importance of those expectations to them.

(4) Finally, DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown urge researchers to employ more sophisticated analytic techniques to the data that they collect and particularly to look at the interactions among variables. Although they focus on the need for greater use of the relatively simple technique of cross-tabulation analysis, the present study suggests the much higher payoff that is possible from the use of more sophisticated techniques now relatively commonplace in marketing research, namely, analysis of variance, factor analysis, and multiple regression. These techniques permit examinations of the entire set of predictor variables simultaneously to learn which are most important in explaining the variability in planned attendance.

Thus, in summary, what we have sought to achieve in the present study is to use more advanced analytic techniques and to introduce several new audience measures in the expectation that these innovations

will yield better predictions of future attendance and better explanations of responses to changes in arts offerings. Before proceeding to the analysis of future attendance, it will be desirable to describe in more detail three of the new sets of variables introduced here--life styles, attitudes, and family life cycle--since they are relatively complex and possibly are new to some readers of this report. We begin with the concept of life style, which occupies a central position in the analysis.

2. Life Style

In the field of marketing, the study of consumer life styles, or "psychographic" profiles, has emerged in the past decade as a major part of an effort to provide detailed insight into consumer decision patterns. A description of a consumer's life style typically notes the *activities* in which the consumer commonly participates (e.g., going to church, camping), the *interests* of the consumer (e.g., liking to eat, liking to travel), and the *opinions* of the consumer (e.g., most men would cheat on their wives if given the chance; there should be a gun in every home). For this reason, life-style data are often called activity, interest, and opinion (AIO) data. By constructing a broad-based life-style profile, the researcher's intent is to show how the consumption of a particular product or service fits into the context of the consumer's chosen way of life.

Besides the expanded perspective on consumption provided by life-style analysis, these descriptions often provide profiles of consumer purchases that are greater in depth and clarity than those provided

by simpler demographic information about the consumer. Among the product and service choices that have benefited from life-style analysis are bank charge cards (21), department stores (14), television programs (22), shotgun ammunition (27), and clothing (4). A number of further studies have shown that the predictive power of such psychographic profiles can be superior to that of basic demographic characteristics (e.g., 3, 8, 10, 20, 29). Thus, life-style analysis can be a practical tool for understanding consumer choice. It can also be subjectively insightful, as we shall suggest below.

The methods used in obtaining psychographic profiles are somewhat varied, but they usually involve having a large number of people (often over 1,000) respond to a large number of scaled activity, interest, and opinion questions (often over 100). The questions may involve either general life style--in which case they are often drawn from a pool of more or less standard items--or a life style specific to the consumption area under study (e.g., cooking). In the latter case the items must be specially developed.

Consumer responses to the AIO questions may be analyzed in several ways. The most direct way is to simply profile the responses of users versus nonusers of a product or service (for example, those with and without bank charge cards). More typically, however, life-style dimensions are developed through a procedure such as factor analysis in order to combine AIO items into underlying dimensions. It is also common to use a cluster analysis or Q-type factor analysis to group respondents into life-style categories. (The present study

employs both procedures, as described in Appendix B.) In either case, the reduced life-style dimensions or groups are then related to the choice or preference behavior of interest in order to examine the impact of life style on these consumption responses.

To the marketing practitioner, analysis of consumer life styles offers a means for probing into reasons for consumer choice more deeply than is allowed by standard demographic variables such as age, income, and family size. This deeper awareness of how consumer purchases facilitate or reflect individual life styles can offer major insights for programs designed to communicate more effectively with these consumers.

In the present study, consumer life style was measured at two different levels. The first level was the individual's use of leisure time, or what may be called "going-out behavior". The second level was the individual's more general activities, interests, and opinions in which the leisure activities are imbedded.

a. Leisure Life-Style Characteristics

The first type of life style analyzed was based on responses to a set of 50 questions about leisure-time activities, interests, and opinions. These data were then used to group respondents into leisure-specific life-style categories. Unlike the analysis of the general life-style characteristics to be discussed later, for the leisure life styles so-called Q-type factor analysis was performed on the answers to these 50 questions in order to group respondents into unique leisure-time use categories, recognizing that this procedure does some disservice

to those respondents with mixed life styles (see Appendix B). The objective of this analysis was to find types of life styles (i.e., people) rather than types of life-style characteristics (i.e., traits).

In developing the leisure life-style groups, a number of different possible groupings from the Q-type factor analysis were examined, and these solutions were tested for stability between two randomly chosen halves of the respondents. A solution was selected that partitioned the population into six unique clusters. Names for each group and the distribution of respondents across the groups are given in Table 7.[2] Figures 1 through 6 report four to six activities, interests,

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY LEISURE LIFE-STYLE GROUPING

Life-style group	Number	Percent
Passive Homebody	295	20
Active Sports Enthusiast	285	19
Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	216	14
Culture Patron	295	20
Active Homebody	190	13
Socially Active	210	14
Total	1,491	100

[2]Note that because of the special nature of the present sample, the proportions in Table 7 are not projectable to the general populations of the cities in this study. Thus, for example, we cannot say that 20 percent of *all* those over age 14 in the four cities are Passive Homebodies.

FIGURE 1

SELECTED ACTIVITIES, INTERESTS, AND
OPINIONS OF PASSIVE HOMEBODY
LIFE-STYLE GROUP

<u>They do or agree with the following</u>:

1. Television is my primary source of entertainment (interest).
2. I am a homebody (interest).
3. I watch TV in order to quietly relax (interest).
4. I would rather spend a quiet evening at home than go to a party (interest).
5. My days seem to follow a definite routine (interest).

<u>They do not do or disagree with the following</u>:

1. See a movie in a movie theater (activity).
2. Go bowling (activity).
3. Go to a sports event (activity).
4. Work on an arts or crafts project of your own (activity).
5. Go out to dinner at a restaurant (activity).
6. Play tennis (activity).

Number in group = 295 (20% of sample)

FIGURE 2

SELECTED ACTIVITIES, INTERESTS, AND
OPINIONS OF ACTIVE SPORTS ENTHUSIAST LIFE-STYLE GROUP

They do or agree with the following:

1. Go bowling (activity).
2. Go to a sports event (activity).
3. Play tennis (activity).
4. See a movie in a movie theater (activity).
5. I like to attend sporting events (interest).
6. I can't see myself going to an opera (interest).

They do not do or disagree with the following:

1. I would rather spend a quiet evening at home than go to a party (interest).
2. Many of my friends are interested in symphony concerts (interest).
3. Many of my friends are interested in the theater (interest).
4. I usually know which symphony concerts are being performed around here (interest).
5. I am a homebody (interest).
6. I usually know which play is being performed around here (interest).

Number in group = 285 (19% of sample)

FIGURE 3

SELECTED ACTIVITIES, INTERESTS, AND OPINIONS OF INNER-DIRECTED SELF-SUFFICIENT LIFE-STYLE GROUP

They do or agree with the following:

1. Do yard work or gardening outdoors (activity).
2. Read a book for pleasure (activity).
3. I'd rather read a good book than a newspaper (interest).
4. Work on an arts or crafts project of your own (activity).
5. Go on a picnic (activity).

They do not do or disagree with the following:

1. I enjoy many foreign films (interest).
2. I do more things socially than most of my friends do (interest).
3. I usually know which symphony concerts are being performed around here (interest).
4. Many of my friends are interested in symphony concerts (interest).

Number in group = 216 (14% of sample)

FIGURE 4

SELECTED ACTIVITIES, INTERESTS, AND
OPINIONS OF CULTURE PATRON LIFE-STYLE GROUP

They do or agree with the following:

1. Went to a play in the past 12 months (activity).
2. Went to a symphony orchestra concert in the last 12 months (activity).
3. Visited an art gallery or museum in the last 12 months (activity).
4. The arts are more important to me than to most other people (interest).

They do not do or disagree with the following:

1. My major hobby is my family (interest).
2. Television is my primary source of entertainment (interest).
3. Watch TV other than sports events (activity).
4. I watch TV in order to quietly relax (activity).
5. Watch a sports event on TV (activity).
6. If cultural organizations cannot pay their own way, they should go out of business (opinion).

Number in group = 295 (20% of sample).

FIGURE 5

SELECTED ACTIVITIES, INTERESTS, AND
OPINIONS OF ACTIVE HOMEBODY LIFE-STYLE GROUP

They do or agree with the following:

1. Play golf (activity).
2. Work on your car (activity).
3. I would rather spend a quiet evening at home than go to a party (interest).
4. I don't often listen to the radio (interest).
5. Most of the arts and cultural activities in the area are not for someone like me (interest).
6. I am a homebody (interest).

They do not do or disagree with the following:

1. Watch TV other than sports (activity).
2. I watch TV in order to quietly relax (interest).
3. Read a book for pleasure (activity).
4. Give or attend a party (activity).

Number in group = 190 (13% of sample)

FIGURE 6

SELECTED ACTIVITIES, INTERESTS, AND
OPINIONS OF SOCIALLY ACTIVE LIFE-STYLE GROUP

They do or agree with the following:

1. Go to a meeting of a social or service club (activity).
2. Give or attend a party (activity).
3. Go on a picnic (activity).
4. I usually know which plays are being performed around here (interest).

They do not do or disagree with the following:

1. I'd rather read a good book than a newspaper (interest).
2. I would rather spend a quiet evening at home than go to a party (interest).
3. I can't see myself going to an opera (interest).
4. I like to read nonfiction books (interest).
5. I have less leisure time compared to other people I know (interest).

Number in group = 210 (14% of sample)

and opinions that most typify each group and four to six that least typify it. Table B1 in Appendix B provides a more detailed summary of the mean scores of each group on each of the 50 variables used to construct the typologies. The answers to the questions have been "standardized" so that the average score, across *all* groups, is zero and the group scores range between +1 and -1.

The six leisure life-style groups may be characterized as follows:

The Passive Homebody.--This group prefers family- and home-oriented activities. Its members are heavy watchers of television, have essentially negative attitudes toward cultural organizations and activities, and, in fact, tend to avoid nearly any activity outside the home, such as bowling, eating out, or seeing a movie. These people recognize that their days are routine and filled with unused leisure time.

The Active Sports Enthusiast.--In many ways this group is the antithesis of the previous group. They take part in many active sports, such as tennis and bowling, and engage in other outgoing activities, such as movies, parties, and spectator sports. They strongly disagree that they are homebodies or like to spend a quiet evening at home. On the other hand, they are like the homebodies, but more extreme, in their negative attitudes toward theater, symphony, and other cultural activities.

The Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient.--Members of this group are best characterized by their participation in a number of industrious home-oriented activities, such as gardening, reading, and craft projects. They are family-oriented and prone to undertake outdoor activities such as hiking and picnics. They are inactive and uninformed when it comes to

cultural activities, although they are not negative toward these activities as are the Passive Homebody and Active Sports Enthusiast groups. They are not overburdened with leisure time as is the Passive Homebody. Instead, it appears that their leisure interests keep them busy, either alone or with their family.

The Culture Patron.--This group would be expected to be the best market for theater and symphony, since they report that they are now involved with these activities. This is a reflection of their general cultural orientation, with favorable attitudes toward and partronage of the arts in general. They lack the orientation toward home and family of the Passive Homebody and the Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient and the sports orientation of the Active Sports Enthusiast. They rely very little on television for entertainment or relaxation.

The Active Homebody.--Members of this group resemble the Passive Homebody group in their home- and family-orientation, but replace that group's nonactive TV-watching with such activities as golf, working on the car, and gardening. They have a generally negative attitude toward the arts and do little reading, partying, or radio listening. In other words, they are not very socially active or media-oriented, but fill their time with what might be called productive "tinkering" activities.

The Socially Active.--This last group is also active, but in a more social vein. They give and attend parties, eat out often, and participate in clubs and other meetings. They are aware of theater and symphony offerings and have friends who are interested in these activities. Nevertheless, their own patronage is presently not great. They are busy and cannot abide leisurely pursuits such as golf, reading, or spending a quiet evening at home.

In the present context, then, the Culture Patron and Socially Active groups have leisure life styles that appear to be conducive to attending the performing arts. On the other hand, the Passive Homebody, Active Homebody, and Active Sports Enthusiast groups would appear to be negatively predisposed toward attendance. Finally, the Inner-Directed Self-Sufficent group appears generally uninformed, and possibly neutral, about the arts. It may be expected that these differences will prove instructive in the analyses of future behavior response to our manipulations in the sections to follow.

b. General Life-Style Chracteristics

Differences in leisure life styles are likely to be associated with both socioeconomic characteristics and other, more general activities, interests, and opinions. Descriptions of general life styles were developed through 43 questions asked in the study. These questions were then factor analyzed to yield underlying dimensions along which our six groups might be expected to vary. The methodology used to accomplish this was an R-type factor analysis, which develops a small number of independent dimensions (in this case, six) that are highly correlated with subsets of the original 43 variables. It is a grouping of characteristics, *not* of people. The correlation coefficients measuring the degree of relationship between the original variables and the six new dimensions (factors) are shown in Table B2 of Appendix B, which also presents a more detailed description of the analytical procedures. The larger coefficients for each dimension may be used in labeling the factors. For instance, the first factor has high positive correlations

(over .30) with church-going, old-fashioned tastes, and wishing for the good old days. These and other high correlations point to variables that the factor most closely resembles (or in the case of negative correlations, resembles the opposite of); they thus aid in naming the factor.[3]

The six general life-style dimensions developed in this study are the following:

Traditionalism.--As noted, this characteristic is associated with church-going, old-fashioned tastes, a feeling that things are moving too fast, and a wish for the good old days. It is also related to preferences for a traditional child- and family-centered home where the man is in charge and the woman is home-oriented. Finally, it includes a preference for security and an unwillingness to take chances.

Hedonism/Optimism.--This characteristic involves wanting to look attractive and perhaps a little different, wanting to travel around the world or live in London or Paris for a year, and liking to eat. It is associated with the positive view that one's greatest achievements lie ahead.

Defeatism.--This characteristic is marked by a depressed outlook due to a belief that things have not turned out so well. One's present life is thought undesirable; if given the chance, one would do things differently. It is also associated with wishing for the good old days, thinking things are changing too fast, spending for today, and dreading the future.

---

[3]It may be noted that a small number of items from the leisure life-style analysis are used in the general analysis.

Self-Confidence/Opinion Leadership.--Two characteristics seem best to describe this dimension--a feeling of self-confidence and liking to be considered a leader.

Urbanism.--This factor involves a preference for big cities and support for Women's Liberation.

Outdoorsiness.--This dimension involves going on picnics and hiking.

3. Attitudes toward Theater and Symphony

The life-style approach to explaining arts behavior is a general one; it examines how various arts behaviors fit into more general life patterns. Attitude researchers focus instead on predicting behavior by understanding the nature and value of the various outcomes that an individual expects from engaging in a behavior (e.g., attending theater or symphony).[4] Behaviors that yield positive outcomes on important dimensions will be adopted; those that do not yield positive outcomes or that yield positive outcomes only on unimportant dimensions will not be adopted. This approach, following the work of Fishbein and Ajzen (6), Rosenberg (23), and others (e.g., 9), has proved useful to marketers in predicting purchase intentions, actual purchases of such products as children's clothing (26), and TV program selection (12).

In the present investigation, subsamples of consumers were asked about their attitudes toward attending the two performing arts under study. As indicated earlier, because of the length of the overall questionnaire,

---

[4]It is important to note that it is attitude toward an action (e.g., buying a Rolls Royce) rather than attitude toward an object or event (e.g., a Rolls Royce) that generally is found to predict behavior best.

attitudes about theater attendance were only asked of one-third of the sample and attitudes about symphony attendance were only asked of another third. Each participating respondent was asked two questions, the first of which asked the following:

> If you were to go to a live, professional play (symphony concert) in the next month or two, how likely would it be that you would experience the following:
>
> a. You could get exactly the seats you wanted?
>
> b. It would not take a long time to get from your home into the theater (concert hall)?
>
> c. You would feel comfortable with the audience?
>
> d. You would not find the play (concert) too long?
>
> e. You would feel personally involved with what was going on at the performance?
>
> f. You would find your friends there?
>
> g. You would feel pleased that you were going long before the performance day?
>
> h. You would find the tickets inexpensive?
>
> i. You would not feel that it was too formal an occasion?
>
> j. You would find the performers excellent?
>
> k. You would not feel you'd spent too much for the occasion, that is, for tickets, travel, food and the like?
>
> l. You would like the play (program)?
>
> m. You would feel you understood what was going on?
>
> n. You would find that those you were with were having a good time?
>
> o. You would learn a lot?
>
> p. You would not feel you were wasting your time?
>
> q. You would feel stimulated?

Respondents were asked whether it would be "very likely," "somewhat likely," "somewhat unlikely," or "very unlikely" that each would be experienced.

The next question read as follows:

> We've just talked about how likely it would be to experience certain things when going to a live play (symphony concert). If you were to go to a live, professional play (symphony concert) in the next month or two, how important would it be that you would experience these same things?

Respondents were then given the same 17 items as in the preceding question and asked whether each outcome would be "very important," "somewhat important," "somewhat unimportant," or "very unimportant."

Specific beliefs and importance scores on each of the 17 attributes for each of the four study cities are given in Tables 8 and 9.

The data in Table 8 show that, when thinking of attending theater, respondents give highest importance weightings to the play and performance characteristics and to understanding what is going on. Finding friends there, having the occasion informal, and having the theater nearby appear to be least important.

There are differences across the four cities with respect to expectations about attending the theater.[5] These differences appear to be greatest for Memphis. Respondents there are more likely to expect plays to be

(1) Not too long

(2) Personally involving

(3) Performed well

---

[5]Differences across cities were tested at the .05 level under one-way analysis of variance.

TABLE 8

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT OUTCOMES OF ATTENDING THEATER AND IMPORTANCE OF THESE OUTCOMES, BY CITY[a]

Outcome	Atlanta		Baton Rouge		Columbia		Memphis		Total	
	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.
Can get exact seats	2.71	3.06	2.54	3.11	2.64	3.02	2.88	3.14	2.69	3.08
Theater is nearby	2.70	2.78	2.81	2.77	2.59	2.79	2.70	2.58	2.70	2.73
Comfortable with audience	3.26	3.05	3.27	3.09	3.24	3.05	3.46	3.25	3.31	3.11
Play not too long**++	2.99	2.95	2.89	2.98	2.62	2.89	3.26	3.24	2.93	3.02
Feel personally involved++	2.95	3.24	2.96	3.20	2.82	3.00	3.19	3.17	2.98	3.15
Find friends there**++	2.10	2.29	2.51	2.62	2.55	2.50	2.80	2.75	2.49	2.54
Feel pleased before going**++	2.87	2.85	2.85	2.81	2.98	2.82	3.20	3.17	2.98	2.91
Tickets inexpensive	2.37	3.05	2.72	3.06	2.50	3.01	2.55	3.08	2.54	3.05
Not too formal	2.67	2.67	2.60	2.65	2.62	2.73	2.79	2.81	2.67	2.72
Performers excellent**+	3.10	3.39	3.06	3.37	2.96	3.32	3.30	3.56	3.10	3.41
Not spent too much	2.63	3.01	2.82	2.99	2.69	3.15	2.89	3.13	2.76	3.07
Like play	3.23	3.64	3.34	3.55	3.28	3.48	3.45	3.61	3.33	3.57
Understand	3.47	3.52	3.40	3.54	3.29	3.43	3.43	3.53	3.40	3.51
Friends have good time*++	3.16	3.40	3.33	3.31	3.16	3.23	3.41	3.54	3.27	3.37
Learn a lot	3.10	3.12	3.18	3.21	3.04	3.17	3.29	3.33	3.15	3.21
Not feel time wasted**	3.10	3.43	2.88	3.26	2.81	3.35	3.21	3.44	3.00	3.37
Feel stimulated**	2.95	3.21	3.05	3.22	3.01	3.23	3.38	3.37	3.10	3.26

[a]Higher scores indicate more positive expectations or greater importance. Scores ranged from 1 to 4 on each expectation scale and from 1 to 5 on each importance scale. (Note that "neutral" in the importance questions 10 and 12 in Appendix C was treated as a midpoint and the remaining values were rescaled.)

*Differences in expectations across cities significant at the .05 level.

**Differences in expectations across cities significant at the .01 level.

+Differences in importances across cities significant at the .05 level.

++Differences in importances across cities significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 9

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT OUTCOMES OF ATTENDING SYMPHONY AND IMPORTANCE OF THESE OUTCOMES, BY CITY[a]

Outcome	Atlanta		Baton Rouge		Columbia		Memphis		Total	
	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.	Expc.	Imp.
Can get exact seats*	2.65	2.96	2.33	2.90	2.63	2.98	2.70	2.93	2.58	2.94
Hall is nearby++	2.79	2.79	2.80	2.90	2.66	2.88	2.57	2.51	2.70	2.77
Comfortable with audience	3.16	2.98	3.16	2.98	3.14	2.95	3.25	3.23	3.18	3.03
Concert not too long	2.85	3.04	2.62	3.03	2.76	3.00	2.91	3.17	2.79	3.06
Feel personally involved	2.88	3.04	2.75	3.04	2.92	3.04	3.02	3.15	2.89	3.07
Find friends there**++	2.12	2.21	2.44	2.72	2.52	2.53	2.63	2.60	2.42	2.52
Feel pleased before going	2.99	2.75	2.81	2.84	3.00	2.96	3.01	3.06	2.95	2.90
Tickets inexpensive	2.52	2.99	2.59	2.93	2.39	3.04	2.44	3.06	2.49	3.00
Not too formal	2.78	2.62	2.47	2.59	2.65	2.85	2.79	2.75	2.67	2.70
Performers excellent	3.17	3.40	3.16	3.35	3.16	3.26	3.35	3.51	3.21	3.38
Not spent too much	2.94	2.99	2.65	2.86	2.78	3.02	2.89	3.14	2.81	3.00
Like program	3.17	3.47	3.12	3.45	3.06	3.43	3.23	3.61	3.14	3.49
Understand	2.99	3.40	3.09	3.31	3.20	3.44	3.23	3.47	3.12	3.40
Friends have good time	3.11	3.22	3.04	3.21	3.23	3.21	3.19	3.41	3.14	3.26
Learn a lot	3.08	3.07	2.98	3.26	3.10	3.11	3.27	3.25	3.11	3.17
Not feel time wasted**+	3.03	3.26	2.68	3.18	2.93	3.44	3.13	3.41	2.94	3.32
Feel stimulated*	3.07	3.08	2.84	3.20	3.10	3.27	3.21	3.31	3.05	3.21

[a]Higher scores indicate more positive expectations or greater importance. Scores ranged from 1 to 4 on each expectation scale and from 1 to 5 on each importance scale. (Note that "neutral" in the importance questions 10 and 12 in Appendix C was treated as a midpoint and the remaining values were rescaled.)

*Differences in expectations across cities significant at the .05 level.

**Differences in expectations across cities significant at the .01 level.

+Differences in importances across cities significant at the .05 level.

++Differences in importances across cities significant at the .01 level.

(4) Anticipated with pleasure

(5) Pleasing to those going with them

(6) Stimulating

(7) Not wasteful of one's time

Memphis respondents are also likely to indicate that several of these attributes are more important to them. Atlantans less often expect to find their friends at the theater, and more respondents in Columbia than in other cities expect to find the plays long. In Baton Rouge, respondents expect those going with them to have a good time.

With respect to symphony concerts (Table 9), the respondents again indicate that the performers, the program, and their understanding of what is going on are most important factors, while finding friends there, having the occasion informal, and having the hall nearby are least important.

There are fewer differences across the four cities for symphony than for theater. Table 9, however, does indicate some significant differences. Thus, among respondents in the four cities, those in Baton Rouge believe that it is harder to get the exact seats one wants and that one is more likely to waste one's time at the symphony and less likely to feel stimulated. On the other hand, Memphis and Atlanta respondents are less likely to expect to waste time by attending the symphony. Atlanta respondents are also less likely to expect to find their friends at the symphony, but they seem to think that this is less important. Memphis respondents place less importance on having the hall nearby.

In the regression analyses discussed later, the expectation and importance scores were combined to yield an overall score for attitude toward the act of going to the theater or to a symphony concert. Each individual's expectation score on each of the 14 dimensions was multiplied by the corresponding importance score. These 14 products were then summed to yield the overall individual attitude score. This method of computation assumes that consumers permit high expectation scores on some important dimensions to compensate for low expectation scores on other important dimensions. Alternative combinational rules that have been suggested are summarized by Wright (31); however, their predictive power has not been proven any greater at this stage of our knowledge of attitude modeling.

This model also takes account of a more recent advance in attitude research. Fishbein (6) has argued that the likelihood of engaging in a behavior is not only a function of the individual's own attitude toward a behavior but also depends on what the individual thinks significant others *expect* him or her to do. Therefore, respondents were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with the following statement:

> People who are important to me think I should go to classical symphony concerts (plays).

The resulting attitude model, then, is the following form:[6]

$$BI_{jk} = \sum_{i=1}^{14} I_{ik} B_{ijk} + NB_{jk}$$

---

[6]Separate analyses of alternative decision rules as well as tests of the reliability of the attitude models indicate that for the present

where BI = likelihood of respondent k attending performing art j;

I_{ik} = the importance weight given to consequence i by respondent k;

B_{ijk} = the respondent k's belief about the extent to which attending performing art j will result in consequence i; and

NB_{jk} = normative belief--the extent to which respondent k perceives that significant others believe he or she should attend performing art j.

4. Family Life Cycle

A major alternative to the approach of life-style and attitude theorists is the more mundane approach of social demographers. These researchers argue that behaviors can be predicted by socioeconomic characteristics (such as education), which predispose one to engage in the behavior or which (as with income) remove constraints that bar the carrying out of existing predispositions. These socioeconomic characteristics can be seen, then, as potential determinants of life styles or attitudes, which may then determine behavior or perhaps as codeterminants (with life styles or attitudes) of behavior.

The present study includes a wide range of socioeconomic measures. One combined index developed from several of these measures is a Family Life Cycle (FLC) Index, which is based on the notion that many patterns of behavior are affected by where, chronologically, a person is in his

---

data (1) the "extended model" does well relative to alternative formulations and (2) correlations of all measures with future attendance at symphony and theater vary considerably across independently drawn samples. The latter suggests instability in the attitude models. On the other hand, the overall attitude component did turn out to be a significant predictor of behavior in the multiple regression analysis described later.

or her life cycle. Age itself only approximates this chronology; a better measure is one that accounts for the fact that there are significant points of change in a traditional life cycle that radically alter one's values and life style (11, 28). These points of change and the life cycle that they imply are the following:

Young single.--This is the first stage of the traditional pattern. The individual is under 40 years of age and has never been married.

Young married.--The first important change in one's life (and life style) is marriage. The individual is under 40, married, and has no children.

Children under six.--The next major event is the arrival of young children. In this stage the individual is married and has one or more children under six. This stage can last a considerable period of time.

Children six or over.--The next important event is when the children are all old enough to be in school and both spouses can be free for more activities outside the home.

Empty nest.--Eventually the children leave home and the older married couple is again alone.[7]

Widowed.--The final stage arrives when one of the partners dies.

It was expected that families in the middle stages of the family life cycle would be significantly less likely to be arts attenders owing to the inhibiting presence of children and the accompanying lack of time and money.

---

[7] In our analysis, this classification also includes married couples over 40 who never had children.

5. Regression Results

The question that we consider now is whether these new variables are important predictors in multiple regression analyses of likely future symphony and theater attendance. (It should be kept in mind, however, that we shall be returning to the deficiencies in this approach, particularly emphasizing that the correlations we find do not necessarily mean causation.) In these analyses, variables were used to predict the likelihood of theater and symphony attendance. Table 10 reports simple correlations between the 56 variables and the likelihoods of attending theater and symphony. Simple correlations greater than ±.045 can be considered statistically significant given the sample size.

From the point of view of a total prediction from these correlations, one problem is that many of the variables are related. For example, as income increases so does the likelihood that the spouse is employed (r = .36) and the number of cars in the family (r = .46). The problem then is to conduct an analysis that enables us to assess the importance of several variables in explaining the likelihood of attendance while taking account of these variables' interrelationships. One useful technique for doing this is stepwise regression.[8] In this technique, predictors are selected one at a time, starting with the single best predictor and adding the one variable at each "step" that increases predictive accuracy the most. This continues until the best remaining predictor that could be added produces no significant improvement in overall predictive accuracy.

---

[8] Using Version 7 of SPSS (19).

TABLE 10

SIMPLE CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND LIKELIHOOD OF ATTENDING THEATER AND SYMPHONY

Variable	Correlation with likelihood of attending	
	Theater	Symphony
Culture Patron[a]	.32	.34
Attendance at theater in last 12 months	.32	.25
Interest in theater when growing up	.28	.24
Interest in classical music when growing up	.23	.35
Urbanism	.21	.19
Attendance at symphony in last 12 months	.20	.34
Parents' interest in live theater	.20	.23
Hedonism/Optimism[b]	.20	.20
Self-Confidence/Opinion Leadership[b]	-.20	-.11
Parents' interest in classical music	.19	.28
Education of respondent	.19	.16
Ever attended three plays (but none last year)	-.19	-.13
Ever worked for theater/music/dance production	.18	.14
Lives in Columbia	-.15	-.13
Traditionalism[b]	-.15	-.12
Passive Homebody[a]	-.15	-.12
Listened to classical music 10+ times last year	.14	.17
Active Sports Enthusiast[a]	-.13	-.16
Single adult life-cycle stage	.13	.11
Plays musical instrument	.12	.14
Education of mother	.12	.12
Years in area	-.12	-.09
Age of respondent	-.12	-.07
Education of father	.11	.14
Defeatism[b]	.11	.08
Retired	-.11	-.04
Active Homebody[a]	-.09	-.09
Young-married life-cycle stage	.09	.06

(Table 10 continued)

TABLE 10--Continued

Variable	Correlation with likelihood of attending	
	Theater	Symphony
Socially Active[a]	.08	.10
Lives in Atlanta	.08	.08
Income over $25,000	.08	.05
Employed part time	.08	.04
Empty-nest life-cycle stage	-.07	-.07
Number of children over 14	-.07	-.06
Spouse employed	.07	.00
Homemaker	-.06	-.06
Employed full time	.06	.04
Lives in Memphis	.06	.04
Widowed life-cycle stage	-.06	-.01
Income $10,000 - $11,999	-.05	-.03
Income $15,000 - $19,999	.05	.03
Income under $7,000	-.05	-.02
Outdoorsiness[b]	.05	.02
Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient[a]	-.04	-.08
Young-single life-cycle stage	-.04	.00
Children-under-six life-cycle stage	-.03	-.05
Not employed	-.03	-.03
Income $12,000 - $14,999	.03	.00
Number of cars owned	.02	.18
Income $20,000 - $25,000	.02	.03
Amount of leisure time available	.02	-.02
Female	-.02	-.01
Income $7,000 - $9,999	.01	.03
White	.01	-.02
Temporarily unemployed	.01	.00
Children-six-or-over life-cycle stage	.00	-.02

[a]Leisure life-style group.

[b]General life-style dimension.

a. Theater

Of the 56 variables examined, six were found to add to the prediction of theater attendance likelihood at the .05 level of significance. These six predictors were jointly able to predict 28 percent of the variability in the reported likelihoods of theater attendance. Although this leaves the majority of the variability in these likelihoods "unexplained" (and potentially related to factors not examined in the study), over one-quarter of the variability of theater attendance likelihoods can be accounted for by these factors. This is a relatively high level of predictive power for a marketing study.

The variables that aided this prediction are shown in descending order of usefulness in Table 11. The beta weights in this table may be interpreted as an indication of the relative importance of each predictor variable; the larger the weight, the more useful the variable was found to be. These results may be compared to the simple correlations between each variable and likelihood of attendance. The reason that the importances of variables in the multiple regression are different from those in the simple correlations is that, in the full prediction, the information supplied by variables introduced at one point in the analysis can be highly related to the information supplied by variables entering the analysis at other points, so that the other variables do not appear as important as they would have alone.

Table 11 shows that by quite a substantial margin, the best predictor of the likelihood of future attendance is attitude toward going to the theater. Not surprisingly, the more favorable one thinks the outcomes of attendance will be, the more important these outcomes are;

TABLE 11

MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR VARIABLES PREDICTING LIKELIHOOD OF ATTENDING THEATER[a]

Variable	Standardized beta weight	Simple correlation
Attitude toward attending theater	.31	.38
Culture Patron[b]	.15	.32
Interest in live theater when growing up	.15	.28
Theater attendance during past year	.14	.32
Traditionalism[c]	-.13	-.15
Self-Confidence/Opinion Leadership[c]	-.12	-.20
Number of cases	(222)	(222)
Adjusted R^2	.279	

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

[b]Leisure life-style group.

[c]General life-style dimension.

the more that significant others are seen as favoring attendance, the more one will report likely future attendance. Three variables of approximately equal importance are the next best predictors. All three are measures of positive past experiences with the arts. One variable is interest in live theater when growing up. Favorable socialization to the theater as a child seems to have a strong and lasting effect on future attendance independent of whether one presently has favorable attitudes toward attendance. Also in this predictor group is theater attendance during the past year. As we discussed in an earlier section, past behavior is a good predictor of likely future behavior. However, as we also saw, it is not a perfect predictor. A great deal of variation remains to be explained by the other variables in this equation. One factor that is important is leisure life style--particularly whether one is classified in the Culture Patron leisure life-style group. Here we see that past attendance at not only theater but also at several arts institutions--as well as having other interests and opinions reflecting an arts-centered leisure life style--makes a significant contribution to our knowledge beyond the fact that a given target consumer merely attended the specific art form in the past year or has a favorable attitude toward such attendance in the future. This lends support to our contention that performing arts attendance can profitably be seen from its perspective within particular life styles. It also supports the contention of DiMaggio, Useem, and Brown that "aficionados of one arts form also attend others" (5, p. 176).

Following the three experience variables at a slightly reduced level of importance are two *general* life-style dimensions. Both of these are negatively related to future attendance.

Traditionalism is negatively associated with likely attendance, indicating that those with old-fashioned tastes, a traditional family role structure, and a preference for a slow-moving life are not likely to attend the theater. This suggests that overcoming the inertia of traditional patterns may be a major task of future promoters anxious to broaden theater audiences.

The *Self-Confidence/Opinion Leadership* dimension is also negatively correlated with likely attendance. This suggests that theater attendance may be seen as distracting from the self-esteem of a significant number of respondents. This is a puzzling finding that bears more investigation. (One speculation is that arts attendance is associated with elitism in many people's minds, and joining such a group may be perceived as putting distance between a self-confident leader and those he or she wishes to lead.)

b. Symphony

Table 12 reports beta weights and simple correlations for the five variables that explain about 29 percent of the variance in likely attendance at symphony concerts. Most striking is the fact that although this is an entirely different sample than in the theater analysis, the first four variables--those with the most weight in this equation--are the *same four* variables that are the most important in the theater analysis. Again, attitudes are a significant factor, although not the

TABLE 12

MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR VARIABLES PREDICTING LIKELIHOOD OF ATTENDING SYMPHONY[a]

Variable	Standardized beta weight	Simple correlation
Culture Patron[b]	.25	.34
Attitude toward attending symphony	.21	.33
Symphony attendance during past year	.20	.34
Interest in classical music when growing up	.20	.35
Socially Active[b]	.12	.10
Number of cases	(232)	(232)
Adjusted R^2	.289	

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

[b]Leisure life-style group.

most important variable as in the theater equation. Also, the three experience dimensions--past attendance, interest in the art form when growing up, and membership in the Culture Patron life-style group--are again the remaining variables in this set of most important predictors.

The single new variable in this equation is membership in the Socially Active leisure life-style group. It will be recalled that this was the second group with a life style positively predisposed toward the arts. This finding may lend credence to the suspicion that symphony attendance for some patrons serves social needs beyond any cultural needs it may fulfill.

c. Nonuseful Potential Predictors

The fact that a particular set of variables entered the equations in the preceding two regression analyses does not mean that those which did not enter do not have substantial *simple* correlations with likely attendance. Table 10 attests to this. What the equations do is capture the *best* linear combinations of predictors. Given this task, it is interesting to consider which variables did not enter the equations.

First, all the standard socioeconomic variables used in other studies--education, sex, income, occupation, and so forth--do not turn out to be significant predictors of likely attendance when the attitude and general and specific life-style factors that we have included here are entered into the analysis. This would strongly suggest that where these standard socioeconomic variables are found to be significant in other studies, it is only because the richer set of variables added here are not included.

The second factor that does not show up in our analysis is variation across cities. We did find Columbia generally less responsive to the performing arts at the time of our study, but the analysis determined that even this apparent difference is not sufficiently strong to produce a significant effect on likely attendance. This gives us some confidence that the results reported here are generalizable across cities of different sizes and different cultural opportunities--at least those in the South.

6. Implications of the Associational Approach

The associational approach to segmentation has rather clear implications for building arts audiences. It says that one should take the factors now leading to likely attendance and use them to identify target audiences; where there is some opportunity to modify these characteristics, one should use them in programs to motivate attendance by present nonattenders. In the present analysis, three factors show through in both analyses, and these three should be the starting point for any marketing approach based on this analysis.

a. Attitudes

How positive one expects the outcome to be clearly affects whether one will attend theater or symphony. It will be recalled that these attitude measures had three components:

(1) Expectations regarding the likelihood of obtaining particular benefits;

(2) The importance of those benefits; and

(3) The perception of whether others expect one to attend.

Thus, one can deduce that future attendance may be increased and arts audiences broadened by one of the following three approaches:

(1) Improving expectations about important outcomes;

(2) Increasing the importance weights for outcomes where expectations are highly positive; or

(3) Increasing the perceived pressure brought by significant others to attend.

Improving expectations.--Table 13 indicates that there are 12 expectation dimensions on which nonattenders are significantly less positive than attenders about outcomes from going to the theater; there are nine such dimensions for symphony. Table 14 further indicates that there are seven attributes with average importance scores (above 3.15) for nonattenders for both theater and symphony. If we look at the intersection of these two groups--those attributes where expectations are significantly low while the importance weight is high--we find four dimensions for theater and five for symphony that merit attention. Improved attendance for both theater and symphony may result if nonattenders become more positive about the following:

(1) The likelihood that they would like the particular program (the effect of changing programs is discussed further below);

(2) The likelihood that they would understand what is going on;

(3) The likelihood that those with whom they attend would have a good time; and

(4) The likelihood that the evening would prove stimulating.

In addition, theater attendance might be enhanced if nonattenders felt that the performers were better than we believe to be the case at

TABLE 13

EXPECTATIONS ABOUT OUTCOMES OF ATTENDING THEATER AND SYMPHONY, BY PAST ATTENDANCE[a]

Outcome	Theater		Symphony	
	Past attender	Past nonattender	Past attender	Past nonattender
Can get exact seats	2.83	2.58**	2.73	2.54
Theater/concert hall is nearby	2.80	2.62*	2.77	2.69
Comfortable with audience	3.44	3.21**	3.34	3.14
Play/concert not too long	2.97	2.90	2.78	2.79
Feel personally involved	3.15	2.85**	3.31	2.81**
Find friends there	2.66	2.35**	2.79	2.35**
Feel pleased before going	3.14	2.84**	3.41	2.86**
Tickets inexpensive	2.63	2.45*	2.88	2.40**
Not too formal	2.74	2.62	2.83	2.64
Performers excellent	3.22	3.01**	3.37	3.18
Not spent too much	2.87	2.67*	2.99	3.00
Like play/program	3.51	3.18**	3.43	3.09**
Understand	3.48	3.32**	3.36	3.08**
Friends have good time	3.41	3.15**	3.42	3.08**
Learn a lot	3.21	3.11	3.19	3.09
Not feel time wasted	3.03	2.98	3.24	2.88**
Feel stimulated**	3.20	3.02	3.41	2.98**

[a]Attendance within past 12 months.

*Differences between attenders and nonattenders significant at the .05 level.

**Differences between attenders and nonattenders significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 14

IMPORTANCE OF OUTCOMES OF ATTENDING THEATER AND SYMPHONY, BY PAST ATTENDANCE[a]

Outcome	Theater		Symphony	
	Past attender	Past nonattender	Past attender	Past nonattender
Can get exact seats	3.17	3.02*	2.92	2.95
Theater/concert hall is nearby	2.73	2.73	2.56	2.81*
Comfortable with audience	3.18	3.06	3.04	3.03
Play/concert not too long	3.03	3.01	2.90	3.09
Feel personally involved	3.34	2.99**	3.16	3.05
Find friends there	2.56	2.53	2.55	2.51
Feel pleased before going	2.94	2.89	3.03	3.88
Tickets inexpensive	3.00	3.10	3.03	3.00
Not too formal	2.68	2.75	2.62	2.72
Performers excellent	3.51	3.33**	3.51	3.35
Not spent too much	3.10	3.05	2.99	3.00
Like play/program	3.62	3.53	3.60	3.47
Understand	3.58	3.44**	3.49	3.39
Friends have good time	3.44	3.32	3.23	3.27
Learn a lot	3.21	3.21	3.20	3.17
Not feel time wasted	3.44	3.31	3.41	3.30
Feel stimulated**	3.23	3.30	3.33	3.19

[a]Attendance within past 12 months.

*Differences between attenders and nonattenders significant at the .05 level.

**Differences between attenders and nonattenders significant at the .01 level.

present, and symphony attendance might be increased if nonattenders would come to believe that they were not going to waste their time.

Increasing importances.--Increasing importance weights is a much more difficult task than changing perceptions in marketing in general and often takes many years. The analysis here suggests that the problem in the arts is even more difficult because there are only two cases where there are significantly lower importances reported by nonattenders than by attenders and expectations are also relatively high (i.e., average scores over 3.00). Both of these cases are for theater: One is understanding what was going on; the other is feeling that those with whom you were attending were having a good time. The fact that these are both dimensions where expectations are also significantly lower for nonattenders suggests that they may be areas particularly ripe for promotional focus, although the task of changing both dimensions is admittedly much more difficult.

Increasing the impact of significant others.--Attenders are substantially more likely than nonattenders to agree that significant others expect them to attend theater and symphony. The scores for the two groups are as follows:

	Theater	Symphony
Attenders	2.29	2.54
Nonattenders	1.99	2.04

This factor may potentially be used to induce more attendance through promotions aimed at stimulating personal influence. This may be accomplished

by showing the different types of present attenders in promotions or by encouraging present attenders to bring nonattenders to performances. The latter is a suggestion that we shall discuss more fully later.

b. Leisure Life-Style Groups

As any arts marketer knows, Culture Patrons are excellent prospects for attendance at arts events. The use of mailing lists, programs, and billboards for one performing art to encourage attendance at another should be commonplace in the arts, although reluctance to share mailing lists seems surprisingly high among administrators in this field. What is new and intriguing is the indication that likely attendance at symphony concerts is high among the Socially Active group. This finding would suggest that promotions emphasizing the social dimensions of symphony attendance may bear considerable fruit among this group.

If one is to focus a strategy on members of a specific leisure life-style group, such as the Socially Active, it is quite useful to know their socioeconomic characteristics, media habits, general life-style tendencies, and so forth. Unfortunately we did not find significant differences across the six groups in media habits. Tables 15-18, however, do report those factors that were significantly different across the six leisure life-style groups. These differences yield the following additional insights:

The *Passive Homebodies* tend to be older, with a high proportion being retired and/or widowed. They are less educated and lower in socioeconomic status than other groups. Slightly over one-fourth of them are nonwhite. They are highly traditional and see themselves as opinion

TABLE 15

SIGNIFICANT DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES AMONG LEISURE LIFE-STYLE GROUPS[a]

Variable	Means or level in overall sample	Life-style group					
		Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active
Number of automobiles	1.8	Low	Very high	High		High	
Years in present area	19.7	Very high	Low		Low		
Education (years)	13.1	Very low			Very high		
Father's education (years)	12.1	Very low	High		High		
Mother's education (years)	11.7	Very low	High		High		
Employed full time	48%	Very low	High	High			
Two-worker household	58%	Very low	High		High	Low	
Occupation:							
Professional	10%				Very high		
Managerial	10%				Very high		
Sales/clerical	8%		High		High		
Retired	8%	Very high				High	High
Income	$10,714	Very low		Very high		High	
Nonwhite	21%	Very high	High	Very low			High
Males	37%	Low	High	Low		High	

[a]Chance probability less than 5 percent by F-test or Chi-square test.

TABLE 16

DIFFERENCES IN CHILDHOOD EXPOSURE TO THE ARTS AND AMOUNT OF LEISURE TIME AMONG LEISURE LIFE-STYLE GROUPS[a]

Variable	Level in overall sample	Life-style group					
		Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active
Childhood interest in theater	Moderate	High			Very high		High
Parents' interest in theater	Low			Low	Very high	Low	High
Childhood interest in classical music	Moderate	High	Low		Very high		Very high
Parents' interest in classical music	Moderate/low				Very high	Low	High
Amount of leisure time compared to others	About the same as others			High		Very high	High

[a]Chance probability less than 5 percent by F-test or Chi-square test.

TABLE 17

DIFFERENCES IN FAMILY LIFE CYCLE AMONG
LEISURE LIFE-STYLE GROUPS

Life-cycle variable	Percent of sample	Life-style group					
		Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active
Teenagers	15		High		High		
Single adults	8		High		High		
Young marrieds	10		High	High			
Children under six	22			High			
Children six or over	27	High		High			High
Older marrieds	11	High				High	High
Widowed	8	High					

TABLE 18

DIFFERENCES IN GENERAL LIFE STYLE AMONG
LEISURE LIFE-STYLE GROUPS

General life-style factor	Level in overall sample	Life-style group					
		Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active
Traditionalism	Moderate	Very high			Very low		
Hedonism/Optimism	Moderate	Very low			Very high		
Defeatism	Moderate	Low	Very high	Low			
Self-Confidence/ Opinion Leadership	Moderate	Very high		Low	Very low	Very low	
Urbanism	Moderate	Very low			Very high		
Outdoorsiness	Moderate	Very low					High

leaders. They have had some exposure to theater and classical music as children.

The *Active Sports Enthusiasts* tend more often to be teenagers or single adults of highly educated parents. They are slightly more likely than the overall sample to be nonwhite, to constitute a high proportion of two-worker households, and to work full time at moderate status jobs. They feel more defeated in life and have more automobiles than the sample average.

The *Inner-Directed Self-Sufficients* tend to be married, to have young children, to have the highest income level of all six groups, and to be the lowest percent nonwhite of the groups. They tend not to feel defeated or to see themselves as opinion leaders but are outdoors people.

The *Culture Patrons* are members of a highly distinctive group heavily represented in the earlier life-cycle stages. They are optimistic, city-oriented, and highly educated, with high-status occupations but moderate incomes.

The *Active Homebodies* tend to be older married couples, a relatively high proportion of whom are retired. Despite this and the resulting fact that they represent a low proportion of two-worker households, they tend to be high-income families. These characteristics, however, explain why they often report that they have more leisure time.

The *Socially Actives* tend to have older children who may have left the household. Socially Actives are also more likely to be retired and nonwhite. They have more leisure time than the rest of the sample and much more often have had exposure to classical music and theater as children.

These profiles suggest that if symphony marketers wish to promote to Socially Active respondents, they should aim their messages toward older, retired people who are active in giving and going to dinners and parties, possibly portraying a visit to the symphony with other mature, socially active people as a natural complement to their active, social life style. The fact that we have discovered that this group has more leisure time and apparently fewer family responsibilities than other groups leads to the speculation that they may be good workers as well as attenders at the symphony, if working on a fund drive or a related activity can be seen as carried out in the company of other mature adults and as part of an active social life style.

c. Interest in the Arts as a Child

It seems clear that early exposure is a major determinant of arts attendance, as it is of many other leisure behaviors. It appears reasonable to suggest, therefore, that if they have not already done so, both theater and symphony organizations should develop active youth programs, young people's concerts or plays, in-school programs, youth discounts, and the like. Bradley Morison, a marketing consultant to many arts organizations, recently stated his belief that the development of an active children's theater program at the Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis was largely responsible for a drop of five years in the average age of attenders at the Guthrie between 1963 and 1973.[9] This infusion of youthful attendees is, Morison argues, a source of continuing vitality to such established organizations. Constant

[9]Comments made at a Conference on Planning for the Arts, University of Illinois, Urbana, January 17, 1978.

measurement of the effects of youth programs seems necessary, preferably through panel studies. It should also be commonplace for these organizations to develop mailing lists of participants in school or youth programs if this early exposure is to be turned into active adult patronage of symphony and theater. It may also be useful to consider longer-term series discount programs (perhaps billed as "learners' discounts" to encourage adult patronage.

7. Deficiencies of the Associational Approach

The associational approach suffers from three major defects. First, it measures association, not causation. The implications drawn above assume causation, but it is entirely possible that the causation may be in the other direction or due to some third variable. Attendance at theater and symphony now may, for example, lead to favorable attitudes and not the other way around. This is not an implausible explanation. Further, attendance at theater or symphony may have led to attendance at other cultural institutions, not the reverse. This is somewhat less plausible, but as Ryans and Weinberg (24) point out, we know very little about how people "learn" to attend arts events over time. It is even possible, although much less plausible, that childhood interest in the arts and likely future patronage have a causal structure opposite to reasonable expectations if present involvement causes people more often to remember childhood involvements. The problem with this "causation/association" deficiency is that we do not know if a particular change in marketing strategy will cause the desired result just because it is associated with the desired result.

A second deficiency is that the associational approach is based on a measure of likely future attendance that may lack external reliability and validity (i.e., it may predict actual future behavior poorly).

A third deficiency with this approach is that it seldom directly relates to the marketing mix elements that an arts administrator can manipulate. It does not show that if, say, one varied price, a particular result would be likely to occur. We have said, for example, that if specific attitude elements were changed, a general increase in arts attendance could occur; but we did not say how to make such changes. As a consequence, we cannot say that a particular message strategy developed by an administrator or his or her communications specialists would lead to the desired changes in the attitude elements and hence to the desired behavior change. In that sense, our associational findings are one step removed from specifying managerial action outcomes.

In order to be in a better position to suggest such outcomes, we now turn to the "manipulations" approach.

C. The Manipulations Approach

A principal concern in this study was to assess the responsiveness of the present sample to changes in the offerings made by the performing arts in the communities under study. To do this, we constructed a series of "what if" statements embodying new offerings that had been tried in other communities (and in a few cases, in the communities studied[10]) or had been proposed elsewhere and that could be explained to our

[10]Telephone and credit card purchases are possible in Atlanta, and all four cities offer season tickets.

respondents in telephone interviews.[11] It is essential to point out at this juncture that "what if" questions are biased predictors of actual short-run behavior. Respondents are speculating on their future behavior with respect to hypothetical alternatives. The likelihood of their carrying through their speculation in the event the alternative was introduced is low. For this reason, the absolute responses reported in the following discussion should not be considered very good predictors of absolute levels of response. That is, to say that X percent of respondents in the study will respond to offer Y is not to say that the result of actually offering Y will be X. It is our belief that our responses in general overestimated the true responses.

Then why ask about hypothetical offers? The answer is that we are willing to assume that whatever bias is found in the answers is constant across the hypothetical offers. That is, if the response to offer Y is "really" too high, then the response to offer Z is also likely to be too high. This reasonable assumption permits us to compare similarly biased offerings. This is, indeed, our objective: To discover which offerings are relatively more effective in broadening the audience for the performing arts.

1. The Manipulations

The marketing strategies of major business organizations revolve around manipulations of what one author has called "the four P's" (15):

Product: What products and services are offered

---

[11] This criterion restricted us from asking about several of the voucher plans in practice or planned around the country.

Price: What the level and conditions of retail cost are

Place: Where and how the products and services are offered

Promotion: Where and how one communicates information and attitude change messages about the offerings

In the context of telephone interviews, it was not possible to manipulate the "promotion" element of the mix of marketing variables. However, the following variables were manipulated:

a) Product variables

(1) Type of performance (play or concert)

(2) Quality of performance

(3) Formality of atmosphere

(4) Extent of learning opportunities

(5) Quality of seating

b) Price

(1) Price of individual tickets for single performances

(2) Price of multiple tickets for single performances

(3) Price of individual tickets for multiple performances (season tickets)

(4) Cost and effort of securing tickets at regular prices

(5) Other special reduced ticket prices

c) Place: Location of performance

Some of the variables were offered individually; some were introduced in combinations either to assess interactions or to make particular offerings more realistic. The offerings were the following:

a) Product variables

(1) Type of performance

It has been argued that a major vehicle for broadening

audiences is to offer programs that would better meet the needs of light attenders or nonattenders. Thus, in this study, respondents were asked whether they would go "much more often," "somewhat more often," "as often," or "less often" if more of the following kinds of programs were offered:

(a) Symphony

i) Symphonies by classical composers such as Mozart and Beethoven

ii) Symphonies by romantic composers such as Brahms and Tchaikovsky

iii) Music by contemporary composers such as Stravinsky

iv) Concertos with soloists

v) Choral music

(b) Theater

i) Musical comedies such as "South Pacific" or "Showboat"

ii) Classical plays such as "Hamlet" or "Macbeth"

iii) Well-known American dramas such as "Death of a Salesman" or "A Streetcar Named Desire"

iv) Modern comedies such as "The Sunshine Boys"

v) Original plays that have never been done before

(2) Quality of performance

Again, it has been argued that new audiences can be attracted by the appearance of well-known performers.[12]

---

[12] It is recognized that fame of the performer and quality of the performance are not perfectly correlated.

Thus, respondents were asked if they would change their frequency of attendance in the following cases:

(a) Symphony

"If guest conductors and famous soloists appeared with the orchestra more frequently"

(b) Theater

"If famous actors and actresses appeared with the company more frequently"

(3) Formality of atmosphere

Many nonattenders seem intimidated by what they think is the formality of arts performances, particularly at symphony concerts. We asked respondents whether they would go more or less often "if you knew that people were dressing more informally at the concert (theater)."

(4) Extent of learning opportunities

Many of those who rarely or never go to arts events say they do so because they "wouldn't understand what was going on." Therefore, respondents were asked whether they would attend more often in the following cases:

(a) Symphony

"If there was a short introductory talk about the music by the conductor before the performance"

(b) Theater

"If there was a short discussion of the play by the director after the performance"

(5) Quality of seating

It was recognized that the purchase of season tickets

can represent for many theatergoers or concertgoers the guarantee of good seats for each performance. To ascertain the effect of this, respondents were asked the following:

> If you could get series tickets which guaranteed good seats for several symphony performances (plays) but there was no price discount, would you purchase a series ticket?

b) Price

Economists argue strongly that the demand for most goods and services is determined largely by price. We asked a series of questions to test this proposition, i.e., that light and nonattenders might be responsive to price manipulations. We asked about prices for different numbers of tickets and performances.

(1) Price of individual tickets for single performances

Here we asked respondents whether they would change their patronage if prices went up *or* down as follows:

> Would you attend more symphony concerts (plays) than you do now if individual tickets were . . .
>
> Reduced by $1?
>
> Reduced by $2?
>
> Reduced by $3?
>
> Would you attend fewer concerts (plays) than you do now if individual ticket prices were . . .
>
> Increased by $1?
>
> Increased by $2?
>
> Increased by $3?

(In both cases, interviewers continued until respondent

said "yes" that they would change their patronage or until all three options were covered.)

(2) Price of multiple tickets for single performances

Businesses often stimulate sales by offering price reductions when customers buy second or third items. Thus, we asked respondents the following:

> Would you go more often, as often, or less often than you do now if after purchasing one ticket at regular price you could get a second ticket at 50% off?

(3) Price of individual tickets for multiple performances

As with individual tickets, we sought to see if demand would be stimulated as follows:

> If you could get series tickets guaranteeing good seats for several symphony performances (plays), would you purchase such a series if there was a . . .
>
> 10% discount?
>
> 20% discount?
>
> 30% discount?

(Again, interviewers continued until respondent said "yes" that they would change their patronage or until all three options were covered.)

(4) Cost and effort of securing tickets at regular prices

Businesses have long recognized that the cost of a purchase to a consumer is more than the price of the good itself. The purchasing act involves information seeking beforehand, going to the selected outlet, paying sometimes scarce cash for the item, and carrying it home. To reduce such costs, merchants permit telephone and credit sales and offer home delivery.

Such options are not always available for the performing arts. Thus, we asked respondents whether they would go more often

> If tickets could be purchased by telephone and charged to a national or department store credit card.

c) Location of performance

Businesses have recognized that a cost of purchasing by consumers in old downtown stores is the effort to get there and, in some cases, the fear and disquiet of being in what is perceived as an increasingly "foreign" environment. This is also a problem for many arts centers and theaters located in central-city areas. Many of them are seeking to overcome the problem by bringing performances to the people in neighborhood schools, auditoriums, and theaters. We wished to tap this alternative in the present study by asking about neighborhood performances. However, we recognized that suggesting this alternative alone would be unrealistic. In most communities, neighborhood performances are given in performing spaces that are poorer than downtown theaters or concert halls and therefore may deter many would-be patrons. To compensate for this and to add an extra incentive, most touring companies offer some price discounts. To capture these features, the following alternative was presented:

> Suppose that symphony (theater) performances were given five times a year in a location nearer your home. The

performing space wouldn't be as nice as (name of major theater or concert hall in city) but the prices would be 20% lower. Would you go much more often, somewhat more often, as often, or less often than you do now?

d) Combinations

(1) A combination of price, seat quality, and purchase effort

Several major cities are experimenting with discounts for tickets unsold on the day of the performance. While this represents a price saving for consumers, it usually involves poorer seating and added efforts to go to a central location and stand in line to get the desired discount. To capture these complicated features, respondents were asked about their likely patronage under the following circumstances:

> Suppose that next year unsold tickets for performances of the (name of symphony or theater) could be obtained at regular ticket outlets for 50% off on the day of the performance. The seats usually would not be as good as those bought in advance. Would you go much more often, somewhat more often, as often, or less often than you do now?

(2) A combination of type of performance and price

In marketing, product improvements are often accompanied by price increases. We, therefore, sought to learn whether the respondent would pay more if more of his or her favorite music or plays were offered. This could yield us a feeling for the interaction between product characteristics and price. After asking respondents what their

favorite type of music or play was, the following question was asked:

> Let's suppose that your favorite kind of music (play) were presented more often during the year, but ticket prices were raised. Would you go to the symphony (theater) less frequently than you do now if ticket prices were . . .
>
> Increased by $1?
>
> Increased by $2?
>
> Increased by $3?

(Interviewers continued until respondent said "yes" that they would change their patronage or until all three options were covered.)

2. Results

The manipulations, described in detail above, are of two general types. First, there was a diverse set of offerings in response to which the respondents could say that they would go (1) much more often, (2) somewhat more often, (3) as often, or (4) less often. Then, there was a set of questions about series tickets and/or price changes that would indicate at what price the respondent would change behavior. Since they involved different types of responses, the two sets, to be referred to as "new offerings" and "price and series strategies," will be analyzed separately in the subsections to follow.

a. New Offerings

All those who indicated some likelihood of attending theater or symphony in the next year or two were asked whether their attendance would change if several changes were made in the offerings of these

performing arts. Two questions are of interest here: (1) Are some changes in offerings more effective than others in increasing arts attendance; (2) Are some changes more effective than others in broadening the audience.

The answer to the first question is clearly "yes." Indices of relative effectiveness were computed for 12 new offerings for symphony and 12 for theater as follows:

(1) Respondents saying they would go "much more often" as a result of a new offering were counted as two additional attendances; respondents going only "more often" were counted as one. Respondents claiming they would go "less often" were counted as one fewer future attendance.

(2) The resulting number of net new attendances was divided by the number of respondents responding to the new offering to yield an effectiveness score for the offering.

(3) Each effectiveness score was divided by the average effectiveness score for all 12 new offerings and multiplied by 100 to yield the indices reported below.

These calculations make what we believe are reasonable and conservative assumptions in order to allow comparisons of the relative effectiveness of each manipulated offering. The resulting indices calculated for all likely future attenders broken down separately for those who did and did not attend in the past year are reported in Tables 19 and 20. The indices for nonattenders show two obviously superior strategies for drawing more members of this group to the theater and symphony: introducing more "star" performers and offering second tickets for half price. Equally as powerful for nonattending theatergoers is presenting more musical comedies. Of somewhat lesser effect for nonattending concertgoers is offering tickets at one-half off on the day of the performance or presenting a short discussion of the work before the performance.

b. Price and Series Strategies

Table 21 reports indices for price and series strategies for past

TABLE 19

INDICES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR NEW SYMPHONY OFFERINGS, BY PAST ATTENDANCE[a]

Offerings	Past attenders	Past non-attenders	Total
Product variables:			
Type of performance			
More classical music	102	107	105
More romantic music	107	90	97
More contemporary music	53	54	54
More concertos	56	57	57
More choral music	31	49	43
Quality of performance			
More famous performers	150	166	161
Formality of atmosphere			
Dressing more informally	61	100	87
Extent of learning opportunities			
Short talk/discussion	101	121	114
Price:			
Second ticket one-half off	199	180	186
Telephone/credit purchasing	77	81	80
Combination strategies:			
One-half off day of performance, poorer seats	106	121	116
Nearer location, 20 percent discount	76	112	100

[a]Attendance within past 12 months.

TABLE 20

INDICES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR NEW THEATER OFFERINGS, BY PAST ATTENDANCE[a]

Offering	Past attenders	Past non-attenders	Total
Product variables:			
Type of performance			
More musical comedies	142	150	145
More classical plays	32	15	25
More American drama	112	115	113
More modern comedies	124	104	116
More original plays	47	30	40
Quality of performance			
More famous performers	160	160	160
Formality of atmosphere			
Dressing more informally	65	83	72
Extent of learning opportunities			
Short talk/discussion	65	63	64
Price:			
Second ticket one-half off	173	157	166
Telephone/credit purchasing	72	60	67
Combination strategies:			
One-half off day of performance, poorer seats	176	95	144
Nearer location, 20 percent discount	87	81	85

[a]Attendance within past 12 months.

TABLE 21

INDICES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF PRICE AND SERIES STRATEGIES, BY PAST ATTENDANCE[a]

Strategy	Past attenders	Past non-attenders	Total
	Symphony		
Series discount	96	112	107
Individual ticket discount	112	124	120
Individual ticket increase	99	84	89
Favorite program with individual ticket increase	93	87	89
Average	100	102	100
Average sample size	(273)	(142)	(415)
	Theater		
Series discount	108	91	101
Individual ticket discount	108	99	104
Individual ticket increase	101	99	101
Favorite program with individual ticket increase	92	96	94
Average	102	96	100
Average sample size	(253)	(384)	(637)

[a]Attendance within past 12 months.

attenders and nonattenders.[13] Among this set of strategies, for symphony by far the best for increasing revenues from nonattenders is to decrease individual ticket prices. Not surprisingly, this appears substantially better than increasing prices. For theater, price discounts are also somewhat higher in their relative effectiveness, but the variation across all manipulations here is minimal. This is, however, primarily a function of the smaller sample size for symphony manipulations, to which the indices are quite sensitive.

It should be noted, however, that comparing the various price reduction strategies reported in Table 21 with the strategy of offering a second ticket for half off (Tables 19 and 20) indicates that the latter is a substantially better strategy for increasing revenues.[14] That is to say, these data suggest that *more customers will be brought in by offering second tickets at half price than by giving series discounts as high as 30 percent or individual ticket discounts of up to $3.* It may well be that the expression "half off" is the key to this manipulation's success. Alternatively, it may be that it is the "second ticket" aspect of the offer that is crucial, given the importance of interpersonal influences that we have pointed out elsewhere in the study.

---

[13] Indices were computed by calculating the proportion of respondents who responded positively to each alternative (e.g., would buy series tickets, would go more if prices were decreased, or would not go less often if prices were increased) and then comparing the score for the responses of each group for each manipulation to the average responsiveness across all groups for all manipulations within symphony or within theater.

[14] This conclusion was drawn by comparing the proportion of people going more often or much more often in response to a second ticket at one-half price to the proportion of respondents who would go more often with any of the individual or series price discounts offered.

c. Broadening the Audience

The above strategies broaden the audience in the sense that they have high impact on nonattenders, but many also have high impact on attenders. To ascertain whether some of the strategies just discussed have different effects on each group, direct comparisons were made of responses of those who attended symphony or theater in the past year and those who did not. Table 22 shows that there were four strategies by which symphony nonattenders were more positively affected than attenders:[15]

(1) Offering choral music.

(2) Knowing that people were dressing more informally.

(3) Offering symphony performances five times a year nearer home, with a performing space not as nice but prices 20 percent lower.

(4) More famous performers.

There are two problems with these findings. First, it should be noted that according to Table 19, offering choral music had the lowest *total* effectiveness of all the strategies and nearer locations and greater informality drew only average responses among past nonattenders. A second, more critical problem is that it is not clear whether the differences found are because past nonattenders responded positively or because past attenders responded negatively. Indeed, more detailed analyses of responses within life-style groups to be reported later do indicate that the latter may be the case, at least for the "dressing informally" manipulation. The fact that of these four manipulations only "more famous

---

[15] Probability of attenders and nonattenders being the same $\leq .05$. Note that the significance levels may not be reflected in the indices reported earlier because the latter used a weighting scheme that the significance tests ignored.

TABLE 22

PROBABILITY THAT RESPONSES TO NEW OFFERINGS AND PRICE AND SERIES STRATEGIES OF PAST NONATTENDERS AND ATTENDERS ARE THE SAME[a]

Offerings	Symphony	Theater
Product variables:		
Type of performance		
More classical music	.23	
More romantic music	.34	
More contemporary music	.99	
More concertos	.73	
More choral music	.00	
More musical comedies		.82
More classical plays		.09
More American drama		.95
More modern comedies		.43
More original plays		.57
Quality of performance		
More famous performers	.10	.19
Formality of atmosphere		
Dressing more informally	.02	.12
Extent of learning opportunities		
Short talk/discussion	.52	.57
Quality of seating		
Series with good seats, no discount	.89	.58
Price:		
Individual ticket reduction	.37	.33
Second ticket one-half off	.22	.46
Series ticket at discount	.19	.08
Telephone/credit purchasing	.82	.61
Individual ticket increases	.13	.02
Combination strategies:		
One-half off day of performance, poorer seats	.48	.01
Favorite performance with individual ticket increase[b]	.45	.22
Nearer location, 20 percent discount	.05	.40
Approximate number of cases[c]	(420)	(652)

[a]Probabilities are the likelihoods of obtaining computed Chi-square value when responses to offerings are truly independent of past attendance classification.

[b]Selected from the five alternatives indicated above.

[c]Actual number of cases varies by offering.

performers" scored more than 100 on the effectiveness index (Table 19) for both attenders and nonattenders also casts doubt on the ability of these manipulations to broaden the audience while not alienating current patrons.

For theater, two strategies show significant differences between nonattenders and attenders: increasing individual ticket prices and offering tickets at half price on the day of the performance. A glance at Table 20, however, shows that offering half-price second tickets for theater has a more positive effect on theater attenders than on nonattenders. The effect of price increases is more complicated. The proportion of those *decreasing* planned future attendance for each group at each price increase is shown in Table 23. The *total* proportion who will decrease attendance is approximately the same for both groups, as Table 21 indicates. However,

TABLE 23

PERCENTAGE DECREASING PLANNED FUTURE ATTENDANCE OF THEATER, BY PRICE INCREASE

Price increase	Past attenders	Past nonattenders
$1 increase	41	61
$2 increase	30	20
$3 increase	28	19
Total	99[a]	100

[a]Not 100 percent because of rounding.

not surprisingly, past attenders seem to need a somewhat greater price increase before they will decrease planned attendance. Thus, this

strategy is also ineffective for broadening the audience, since low and moderate price increases keep the nonattenders away more whereas higher increases have equal effects on attenders and nonattenders.

d. Responses to Manipulations across Life-Style Groups

As we have emphasized throughout this analysis, a key to understanding people's responses to arts opportunities is an understanding of their leisure life styles. Since these life styles reflect general orientations toward leisure, one might expect that responsiveness to the manipulations employed will also vary by life-style group. And, indeed, as Tables 24, 25, and 26 indicate, there is substantial variation in this responsiveness across life-style groups.[16] In two cases for symphony and four for theater, the differences across these groups in response to the manipulations are significant. For symphony, the only significant differences were in the effects of introducing more choral music and of moving the performance nearer to the respondent's home combined with offering a 20-percent ticket discount. More choral music was most attractive to Active Homebodies and least attractive to Culture Patrons. A nearer location appealed to Active Sports Enthusiasts but not to Passive Homebodies.

For theater, four manipulations had differential effects across life-style groups. Both having more famous performers and dressing more informally are most attractive to Passive Homebodies and least attractive to Culture Patrons. Culture Patrons are most responsive to individual ticket discounts and Active Sports Enthusiasts least responsive. On the

---

[16]The indices in these tables were computed in the same manner as those for Tables 19-21.

TABLE 24

INDICES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF NEW SYMPHONY OFFERINGS, BY LIFE-STYLE GROUP

Variable	Means or level in overall sample	Life-style group					
		Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active
Product variables:							
Type of performance							
More classical music	122	90	93	103	110	111	106
More romantic music	61	82	97	105	93	116	97
More contemporary music	31	73	-10	77	60	42	54
More concertos	89	27	67	42	75	69	57
More choral music[a]	84	37	39	19	-12	85	42
Quality of performance							
More famous performers	121	148	186	170	168	169	162
Formality of atmosphere							
Dressing more informally	99	97	110	83	75	75	87
Extent of learning opportunities							
Short talk/discussion	93	130	128	120	93	114	115
Price:							
Second ticket one-half off	176	176	189	199	145	195	188
Telephone/credit purchase	60	76	115	84	87	71	81
Combination strategies:							
Nearer, 20% discount[a]	124	74	132	86	81	117	100
One-half off day of performance, poorer seats	86	79	132	135	104	117	117
Average	94	93	103	102	90	107	100

[a]Probability is .10 or less that all groups responded equally, using Chi-square analysis of responses collapsed into "more often" and "less often."

TABLE 25

INDICES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF NEW THEATER OFFERINGS, BY LIFE-STYLE GROUP

Variable	Means or level in overall sample	Life-style group					
		Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active
Product variables:							
Type of performance							
More musical comedies[a]	141	148	200	120	139	183	150
More classical plays[a]	26	31	-38	42	52	29	27
More American drama	77	116	122	144	124	93	117
More modern comedies	83	150	126	114	146	114	120
More original plays	21	56	-3	50	24	72	42
Quality of performance							
More famous performers[a]	155	191	153	165	150	170	165
Formality of atmosphere							
Dressing more informally[a]	100	102	75	66	55	62	76
Extent of learning opportunities							
Short talk/discussion	72	94	49	56	44	82	66
Price:							
Second ticket one-half off	187	192	166	163	149	177	172
Telephone/credit purchase	79	83	52	74	55	63	70
Combination strategies:							
Nearer, 20% discount	103	86	78	92	66	124	94
One-half off day of performance, poorer seats	119	96	115	143	83	116	119
Average	89	112	91	102	87	104	100

[a]Probability is .10 or less that all groups responded equally, using Chi-square analysis of responses collapsed into "more often" and "less often" or "the same."

TABLE 26

INDICES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF PRICE AND SERIES STRATEGIES, BY LIFE-STYLE GROUP

Variable	Means or level in overall sample	Life-style group					
		Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active
		Symphony					
Series discount	86	114	87	105	94	132	106
Individual ticket discount	100	111	127	124	126	116	118
Individual ticket increase	97	94	90	90	86	74	88
Favorite program with individual ticket increase	88	84	106	90	71	82	88
Average	93	101	103	102	94	101	100
		Theater					
Series discount	88	113	87	99	104	113	101
Individual ticket discount[a]	102	107	87	110	113	101	104
Individual ticket increase	120	98	93	97	101	100	101
Favorite program with individual ticket increase	99	92	108	91	82	92	94
Average	102	102	94	99	100	101	100

[a]Probability is .10 or less that all groups responded equally using Chi-square analysis of responses collapsed into whether or not attendance would (a) increase with a 10 or 20 percent price discount or (b) decrease with a 10 or 20 percent price increase.

other hand, more Active Sports Enthusiasts said they would pay more for their favorite type of theater presentation than Culture Patrons.

e. Responses to Manipulations within Life-Style Groups

Of critical interest to the issue of broadening the audience is whether there are also differential effects on attenders and nonattenders in each life-style group. To investigate this question, a series of cross tabulations was constructed comparing the responses of past attenders and past nonattenders to the new offerings, price manipulations, and series ticket offers within each life-style group.[17] In four cases each, theater and symphony manipulations yielded different effects for attenders than for nonattenders within specific life-style groups.[18] These data are reported in Table 27.

Symphony.--For symphony, each of the four manipulations had more positive effects on nonattenders than on attenders. However, closer examination of the data in Table 27 allows us to assess whether these differences are due to the nonattenders being "turned on" by the manipulation or to the attenders being "turned off." Such an assessment is possible by comparing the responses of attenders and nonattenders within each of the significant life-style groups listed with the average responses of the remaining sample responding to the manipulation.

This analysis revealed that for three of the four manipulations the significant effects are due to the attenders having a *below* average response

---

[17] Because of the sample sizes, the full range of responses to the new offerings was collapsed into two categories: (1) will go more often and (2) will not go more often.

[18] Significant at .10 level, Chi-square test.

TABLE 27

SIGNIFICANT PROBABILITIES THAT RESPONSES TO NEW OFFERINGS OF PAST NONATTENDERS AND ATTENDERS ARE THE SAME WITHIN LIFE-STYLE GROUPS[a]

Manipulation	Life-style group affected	Group having more positive responses	Significance level
Symphony:			
Dressing more informally	Culture Patron	Nonattenders	.01
More famous performers	Socially Active	Nonattenders	.02
More contemporary music	Socially Active	Nonattenders	.03
More choral music	Passive Homebody	Nonattenders	.07
Theater:			
Telephone/credit purchasing	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Attenders	.10
Telephone/credit purchasing	Socially Active	Attenders	.10
More modern comedies	Socially Active	Attenders	.02
Series ticket at a discount	Culture Patron	Attenders	.02

[a]Probabilities are the likelihoods of obtaining the computed Chi-square value when responses to offerings are truly independent of past attendance classification within life-style groups.

to the offering rather than being due to nonattenders having a significantly *above* average response. Only for the choral music manipulation were the nonattenders in the significant life-style group (Passive Homebodies) positively affected by the offering.

Thus, the life-style analysis is useful on two counts. It indicates not only which groups are affected by the manipulation but also whether the particular offering has differential impact because of its attractiveness or lack of attractiveness to the attenders versus the nonattenders in a particular segment. The finding that the lack of attractiveness for attenders is often the case leads to the suggestion that a differential strategy, except for Passive Homebodies, is not likely to be warranted. (And it will be recalled that offering choral music was the *weakest* strategy overall in Table 19.)

Theater.--Of the four theater manipulations for which attender-nonattender differences emerged within life-style groups, none offers the opportunity to broaden the audience. The analysis shows that offering the opportunity to buy theater tickets by telephone on credit appeals more to attenders than to nonattenders among both the Socially Active and Inner-Directed Self Sufficient life-style groups. The same is true of offering more modern comedies: This appealed more to the present attenders among the Socially Actives. For price discounts on series tickets, the data show that nonattending Culture Patrons are less responsive to the manipulation than attenders. They require larger discounts before they will increase their patronage.

It would appear, therefore, that for both symphony and theater, it is not feasible, except in one instance, to develop strategies that

selectively broaden the audience, i.e., strategies that positively affect nonattenders while not turning off attenders. The preferred strategy for bringing in more past nonattenders is clearly to offer alternatives, such as second tickets at half price, that have a high impact on that group while also attracting more patronage from past attenders.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions to be drawn from this study fall into two broad categories, practical and analytical. The former are the findings of interest to arts managers who would like to translate the study results into concrete actions. The latter are methodological conclusions of interest to those doing further audience studies. We shall discuss each in turn and then close with a brief reminder of some of the limitations of the study.

A. Managerial Conclusions and Recommendations

This study has developed two broad approaches to the issues of whether and how one can broaden the audience for the arts. The first approach, it will be recalled, was to seek out correlates of future attendance intentions. There the findings were rather striking, since the four major factors that predicted symphony attendance were also the four major predictors of theater attendance (attitudes toward attendance, attendance in the past year, interest in the art form as a child, and membership in the Culture Patron life-style group). On the other hand, it was pointed out that the results were based on association, not causation, and hinged on a dependent measure of future behavior that might be relatively weak.

The second approach, the manipulations analysis, was useful in the sense that for both theater and symphony, it pointed clearly to the need to focus on high-impact strategies rather than on selective strategies. And, in this analysis, the two highest impact strategies were the same for theater and symphony (i.e., offering second tickets at half price from time to time and including more famous performers in the production). Here again, the analyses had their limits, particularly because the evaluations concerned future behavior and were in response to possible offerings that may have been hard to visualize.

On which set of conclusions should the practicing manager rely? If the associational analysis is to be relied on, and if one ignores cost, the recommended actions would include the following:

(1) Improve nonattender symphony/theater expectations about the likelihood that

   (a) They would like the program;

   (b) They would understand what was going on;

   (c) Those with whom they were attending would have a good time;

   (d) The evening would prove stimulating;

   (e) They would find the performers better (theater only);

   (f) They would feel they weren't wasting their time (symphony only).

(2) Increase the importance in leisure-time decisions of

   (a) Understanding what was going on (theater only);

   (b) The feeling that those with you were having a good time (theater only).

(3) Stimulate personal influence of attenders on nonattenders.

(4) Market actively to two life-style groups:

(a) Culture Patrons through promotions developed through other art forms. (Theater patrons may be a particularly good source of symphony patrons.)

(b) Socially Actives (symphony only) through promotions designed to emphasize the positive social benefits of symphony attendance.

(5) Strengthen young people's programs and develop strategies to convert early socialization to the arts into active adult patronage, possibly through improved mailing lists of young people or "learners' discounts."

On the other hand, if the manipulations analysis is to be relied on, as we have already noted the emphasis (again ignoring cost) would be on

(1) Offering second tickets at half price from time to time (although obviously not on a routine basis);

(2) Including famous performers more often in programs;

(3) Including more musical comedies in theater offerings;

(4) Offering more choral music to Passive Homebodies;

(5) Possibly offering symphony tickets at one-half off on the day of the performance or presenting a short discussion before the performance.

(6) Otherwise concentrating on the Inner-Directed Self-Sufficients, Active Sports Enthusiasts, Passive Homebodies, and possibly Socially Actives.

It is hard to selectively motivate Culture Patrons beyond their present level of high attendance, and Active Homebodies are generally unresponsive. More generally, the manipulations analysis suggests that it may be difficult or impossible to devise marketing strategies that will

selectively entice past nonattenders and thus only broaden the audience. Instead, strategies will have to be adopted that work best on nonattenders even though they also seem to work well on attenders.

One theme that does recur in both the associational and manipulations findings is the role of interpersonal influence on attendance. Key attitude items were (1) feeling that those with whom one was attending were having a good time (both expectations and importance) and (2) believing that "people who are important to (you) expect (you) to attend." A life-style group that appeared promising for increased symphony attendance was the Socially Active group, whose leisure life style revolved around being with others in various social activities. Childhood socialization to theater clearly involves the influence of important (parental) others. Finally, one of the two most effective manipulations--offering second tickets at half price--clearly implies attendance with others, perhaps facilitated by this special reduction.

It would seem desirable, therefore, to tie these threads together in a marketing program that uses the second-ticket-half-off manipulation to attract an audience through the stimulation of interpersonal influence. Clearly one possiblity would be to develop a program in which past attenders would buy the regular price tickets and would use the second tickets at half price for past nonattenders or light attenders. The danger, of course, would be a decline in revenues should past attenders use the second ticket at half price themselves, as we have seen they are inclined to do. However, three suggestions (not directly tested in this study) may prove reliable:

(1) The simplest approach is to offer the second tickets at half price, say, once or twice a season and back this with a heavy

media campaign designed to encourage attenders to use the opportunity to introduce nonattenders to the performing arts. This approach might be particularly appealing to the Socially Active group. The disadvantages of this approach are (a) it is costly, since there will be considerable wasted exposure in the media campaign; and (b) present attenders could still use the tickets for spouses, dates, or family members who are also present attenders.

(2) A minimum of *two* tickets would have to be purchased once or twice a season before a third and fourth ticket could be purchased at half price.[19] This should preclude spouses and dates from receiving the benefit of the reduction. It presumably would also lead to use by couples who would be inviting other couples, which would considerably heighten the sociability and interpersonal influence of the occasion. This again, one suspects, might be a particularly appealing strategy for the Socially Active life-style group.

(3) The offer could be made only to season ticket holders, who could buy up to two additional tickets at half price for one or two events provided they used the inexpensive tickets to invite previous nonattenders to the theater (or concert hall). The season ticket holders might be much more inclined to follow the spirit of this suggestion, and, of course, they could not use the tickets for themselves.

---

[19]This strategy was suggested to us by Fedor Salva, University of Illinois graduate student.

Once initial exposure by nonattenders was achieved, our regression results suggest that, since prior attendance is a strong predictor of future attendance, the effect of such occasional price promotions might be to create self-sustaining, season ticket patronage after the price special ceases.

The strategy just noted could thus be feasible even though it might well result in a net decrease in revenues for the particular programs for which it was offered. For a second ticket at half price to be offered on a frequent basis, it would require a sufficient increase in attendance to compensate for the reduction in ticket prices. This possibility would vary according to current unsold seating capacities and market response. It may well deserve experimentation.

The social appeal approach, on the other hand, does seem safe to use regardless of current attendance. In general, social appeals should emphasize that others are increasingly attending theater and symphony locally and are having fun doing so.

In the final analysis, however, it is clear that experimentation is necessary if the real-world value of all the above suggestions is to be assessed. Careful tests could be devised (with the help of outside consultants, if necessary) to explore each of the major proposals offered here, and measures would have to be developed before and after the experiments so that their effects could be ascertained. This obviously argues strongly for a program of experimentation in the four cities studied here, since baseline measures have already been developed. A logical next step for the National Endowment for the Arts in its efforts to determine the feasibility of broadening the audience for the arts would be to subsidize a carefully planned series of such experiments.

B. Analytical Conclusions and Recommendations

This study also yields several conclusions and recommendations of interest to those who wish to conduct studies of arts audiences in the future.

(1) Information about consumer life style (both general and specific), attitudes toward attendance, and childhood exposure to the arts are, along with past attendance patterns, predictors of planned future attendance that are superior to the more commonly used demographic measures. Where feasible, such variables should be included in future arts studies.

(2) Rather lengthy batteries of questions about life styles and attitudes can be asked in telephone interviews, as can proposals of a large number of new offerings. (For example, approximately one-third of our sample was asked to respond to 97 life-style items, 34 attitude items, and at least 17--often 34--offer manipulations, in addition to standard behavioral and demographic questions.)

(3) Results of both the associational and manipulations analyses were quite similar for symphony and theater, and so significant differences in effects in the associational analysis appeared across cities. This would encourage one to conduct joint research among different cultural art forms (e.g., dance or opera) and across other cities (e.g., in the North or West). The ability to make such generalizations, however, is an empirical question, one that bears attention in future replications. The methodology and the questionnaire reproduced here should permit--and, we hope, encourage--such replication.

(4) Although past attendance is an important predictor of future attendance, there is a good deal of volatility between time periods, especially among those who attend only one art form. A useful direction for future research would be to develop panel data on arts attendance over a relatively long period of time. This is an approach now used by most major product marketers. Panel data can provide not only better descriptions of behavioral patterns (e.g., how one "learns" to become a patron) but also insights into the effectiveness of specific marketing programs (e.g., precisely *who* changed behavior when second tickets to a production were introduced). The possibilities using such data are substantial (see 1).

(5) The attitude model developed in the associational analysis, although quite useful, exhibited some instability. Further analysis of the present data is clearly warranted to improve the attitude instrument for future research.

(6) A final limitation of the present study was that both analytical approaches relied on respondents' indications of intended future behavior. If future studies are to rely on such planning information, it is important to learn the extent to which such plans are actually carried out. A follow-up to the present study could evaluate that critical question.

APPENDIX A

DETAILED STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE A1

PERCENTAGE OF FINAL SAMPLE TO MEET SCREENING CRITERIA

Screening criterion	Percent
Went to one or more popular or rock concert	35.3
Listened to classical music ten times or more	46.1
Visited art gallery or museum	44.3
Saw ballet live or on television	43.0
Attended one or more plays	42.3
Attended one or more symphony concerts	14.0
Plays a musical instrument	35.7
Worked in theater/music/dance production	12.3

TABLE A2

SAMPLING RESULTS, BY CITY

Category	Atlanta	Baton Rouge	Columbia	Memphis	Total
Original sample	1,623	1,411	1,520	1,779	6,333
Missing interviewer forms	109	3	175	113	400
Attempted contacts	1,514	1,408	1,345	1,666	5,933
Business and others	146	140	130	130	546
Not in service	339	307	323	462	1,431
Attempted screening	1,029	961	892	1,074	3,956
Noncontact	123	164	63	203	553
Refused	318	235	314	322	1,189
Screened	588	562	515	549	2,214
Ineligibles	79	75	66	94	314
Half of the heavy users	58	58	37	14	167
Attempted main interview	451	429	412	441	1,733
Unavailable and other	31	28	10	19	88
Refused	63	43	17	31	154
Completed interviews	357	358	385	391	1,491
Total refusals	27.0%	28.9%	37.1%	32.9%	33.9%
Ineligible	13.4%	13.3%	12.8%	17.1%	14.2%
Heavy users	19.7%	20.6%	14.4%	5.1%	15.0%

APPENDIX B

TECHNICAL NOTE ON FACTOR ANALYSIS

The analysis of respondent life styles was facilitated by factor analyses of two sets of data.

The first factor analysis of the life-style data was a "Q-type" factor analysis of 50 activity, interest, or opinion items (see Table B1) selected to obtain a profile of the respondents' life styles with respect to leisure time only. In this case, the intent was to classify people into relatively homogeneous leisure-specific life-style groups rather than to obtain factor scores for each person on six life-style dimensions. Thus, the Q-type factor analysis analyzes similarities among people for their responses to different questions, while the R-type factor analysis to be discussed below analyzes similarities in responses to different questions over the entire sample of people. Interpretability and stability were the main criteria guiding the analysis.

The algorithm employed for the Q-type factor analysis is a principal-components analysis with varimax rotations. As with the R-type analysis, the sample was split into two halves, and initial analyses were done separately on each half. Solutions deriving two through nine groups were compared and on the basis of interpretability and comparability of solutions in the two halves, the six-group solution was selected. The normalized means for these six groups on each of the 50 variables used to classify them are shown in Table B1 along with interpretive group titles. Since individuals

TABLE B1

MEAN VARIABLE SCORES (NORMALIZED) FOR EACH LEISURE-SPECIFIC LIFE-STYLE GROUP

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Life-style group						
	Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active	F ratio[b]
Number of times attended rock concert (A)	-0.33	0.24	-0.19	0.43	-0.18	-0.11	25.78
Number of times listened to classical music (A)	0.11	-0.11	-0.18	0.13	-0.08	0.07	4.34
Number of times attended art gallery/museum (A)	-0.28	-0.19	-0.09	0.59	-0.04	-0.05	30.59
Number of times attended classical performance (A)	-0.10	-0.12	-0.10	0.38	-0.09	-0.04	11.42
Number of times saw a ballet (A)	0.25	-0.19	-0.16	0.25	0.05	-0.01	4.10
Number of times saw a play (A)	-0.30	0.17	-0.25	0.84	-0.08	0.01	23.77
Number of times attended symphony orchestra concert (A)	-0.17	-0.19	-0.23	0.67	-0.12	-0.10	37.28
Go bowling (A)	-0.68	0.76	0.12	-0.02	-0.12	-0.05	77.26
Go to sports event (A)	-0.65	0.58	0.08	0.14	0.09	0.17	55.85
Watch a sports event on TV (A)	0.02	0.31	0.12	-0.50	-0.09	0.22	25.50

TABLE B1--Continued

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Life-style group						
	Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active	F ratio[b]
Give or attend a party (A)	-0.63	0.36	-0.15	0.29	-0.40	0.50	65.22
Go out to dinner at restaurant (A)	-0.66	0.04	0.22	0.29	-0.22	0.43	49.25
Go to meeting of social, service club (A)	-0.44	-0.21	0.07	0.07	0.01	0.71	39.98
Play tennis (A)	-0.64	0.53	-0.08	0.34	0.02	-0.24	59.80
Go on a picnic (A)	-0.60	-0.00	0.45	0.06	-0.23	0.51	50.38
Work on crafts project of your own (A)	-0.67	-0.11	0.44	0.38	-0.06	0.15	53.50
Read a book for pleasure (A)	-0.05	-0.38	0.53	0.49	-0.44	-0.24	51.57
See a movie in a theater (A)	-0.69	0.54	0.13	0.34	-0.36	-0.07	71.50
Do yard work or gardening outdoors (A)	-0.28	-0.13	0.56	-0.40	0.29	0.29	40.21
Play golf (A)	-0.35	0.25	-0.16	-0.04	0.73	-0.28	40.50
Work on your car (A)	-0.55	0.32	0.14	-0.15	0.55	-0.10	42.60
Watch TV other than sports (A)	0.38	0.31	0.08	-0.50	-0.78	0.37	71.08

(Table B1 continued)

TABLE B1--Continued

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Life-style group						
	Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active	F ratio[b]
Go hiking (A)	-0.60	0.02	0.26	0.42	0.03	-0.07	39.86
I have more leisure time (O)	0.34	0.19	-0.33	0.05	-0.18	-0.32	20.55
I have more spare time than I need (O)	0.34	0.19	-0.33	0.05	-0.18	-0.32	20.55
Cultural organizations should pay own way (O)	0.35	0.18	-0.30	-0.53	0.21	0.13	36.61
I like to attend sporting events (I)	-0.35	0.51	0.10	-0.33	0.01	0.14	32.55
My friends are interested in theater (I)	0.07	-0.53	-0.27	0.50	-0.12	0.30	44.72
My days follow definite routine (I)	0.43	-0.01	0.03	-0.24	-0.05	-0.24	17.60
I know which plays are here (I)	-0.13	-0.45	-0.29	0.47	-0.14	0.55	49.67
I watch TV to quietly relax (I)	0.52	0.41	-0.22	-0.51	-0.54	0.15	67.53
I enjoy jazz music (I)	-0.05	0.09	-0.24	0.24	-0.30	0.13	11.01
I'd rather read a good book (I)	-0.03	-0.17	0.49	0.38	-0.27	-0.51	38.93

(Table B1 continued)

TABLE B1--Continued

Activity/interest/ opinion[a]	Life-style group						
	Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner-Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active	F ratio[b]
I enjoy many foreign films (I)	0.14	-0.02	-0.47	0.27	-0.16	0.08	17.32
I'd pay extra for high quality TV programs (I)	0.02	-0.03	0.09	0.08	-0.27	0.06	3.65
Arts are more important to me than to others (I)	-0.10	-0.29	-0.28	0.61	-0.13	0.09	35.47
TV is my primary source of entertainment (I)	0.79	0.25	-0.25	-0.64	-0.20	-0.11	92.68
I like to spend a quiet evening at home (I)	0.46	-0.58	0.45	-0.31	0.49	-0.33	77.94
I like adventure movies (I)	-0.02	0.27	0.04	0.12	-0.12	-0.10	6.42
Arts/cultural activities are not for me (I)	0.13	0.38	-0.18	-0.43	0.35	-0.22	32.79
I am a homebody (I)	0.53	-0.46	0.41	-0.50	0.35	-0.16	69.85
My major hobby is my family (I)	0.39	-0.18	0.35	-0.68	0.26	0.07	55.52
I do more things socially than my friends (I)	-0.22	0.20	-0.43	0.16	-0.11	0.34	21.72
I like to read nonfiction books (I)	0.01	-0.16	0.38	0.29	-0.30	-0.34	22.73

(Table B1 continued)

TABLE B1--Continued

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Life-style group						
	Passive Homebody	Active Sports Enthusiast	Inner Directed Self-Sufficient	Culture Patron	Active Homebody	Socially Active	F ratio[b]
My friends like symphony concerts (I)	0.21	-0.53	-0.41	0.43	0.03	0.22	46.39
I don't often listen to radio (A)	0.15	-0.31	-0.09	-0.14	0.40	0.14	16.16
I know which symphony concerts are performed here (I)	0.08	-0.51	-0.39	0.45	-0.06	0.39	47.13
I can't see myself going to an opera (I)	0.09	0.49	-0.07	-0.45	0.29	-0.36	39.89
I glance at most pages of the newspaper (A)	0.12	-0.07	0.01	-0.22	0.02	0.21	6.07
I go to movies to see certain actors or actresses (I)	-0.10	0.07	-0.03	0.07	-0.18	0.13	3.20
Number in group	(295)	(285)	(216)	(295)	(190)	(210)	

[a]For specific measures, see screener questions and questions 5, 21, and 30 in Appendix C.

[b]The F ratio is a measure of the dissimilarity of the means; all F ratios are statistically significant at the .01 level.

(A) Activity.

(I) Interest.

(O) Opinion.

were classified as being in only a single group, there was no need for the Q-type analysis to proceed further.

The second factor analysis was an "R-type" factor analysis of 43 activity, interest, or opinion questions (shown in Table B2) selected from lists to obtain a general life-style profile of respondents. Since these same questions were included in the earlier pretest data and had been factor analyzed at that point, the researchers had some prior-knowledge of the types of factors that would be obtained. It was also necessary that the factor solution obtained be stable and not unduly influenced by chance relationships in the data or peculiarities in the responses of a subset of the sample. Thus, the two major criteria in evaluating the analysis were, again, interpretability and stability.

The R-type factor analysis of general life-style items sought meaningful composites of the original 43 questions through principal-axes factor analyses with varimax rotations and iterative estimation of communalities. On the basis of eigenvalue plots and interpretations of various solutions using 2 through 15 factors, it was decided to retain six factors that together account for 33 percent of the variance on the original questions. Factor loadings and interpretations for these six rotated factors are shown in Table B2. In order to examine the stability of these factors before accepting this solution as final, all solutions using five through eight factors were derived separately for randomly selected halves of the data and then examined for comparability. It was determined that both five- and six-factor solutions were the most stable and allowed derivation of nearly identical factors in both halves of the data. These two solutions were also tested separately with the data from each of the four cities in which samples were obtained. Again both solutions proved to be stable.

TABLE B2

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX: CORRELATIONS OF VARIABLES WITH GENERAL LIFE-STYLE FACTORS

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Factor					
	Traditionalism	Hedonism/ Optimism	Defeatism	Self-Confidence/ Opinion Leadership	Urbanism	Outdoorsiness
Travel by airplane (A)	-.14	.06	-.18	.15	.17	-.03
Go on a picnic (A)	-.06	.11	.04	-.03	.05	.44
Go to church or synagogue (A)	.36	.00	-.08	-.15	-.05	.15
Go hiking (A)	-.17	.17	-.04	.11	-.06	.27
I have old fashioned tastes and habits (I)	.31	-.01	-.02	.07	-.15	-.03
I like being considered a leader (I)	-.01	.19	-.09	.40	.04	.07
I want to leave my present life and do something different (I)	-.05	.12	.49	.04	.01	-.09
My family is close knit (I)	.28	.09	-.31	.08	.03	.13
Shopping is no fun (I)	-.01	-.08	.08	.19	-.07	-.09
I wish for the good old days (I)	.33	.01	.37	.12	-.15	-.07
I work under pressure (I)	-.07	.11	.14	.23	.09	-.07
Everything is changing too fast (O)	.36	-.03	.39	-.03	-.20	-.02

(Table B2 continued)

TABLE B2--Continued

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Factor					
	Traditionalism	Hedonism/ Optimism	Defeatism	Self-Confidence/ Opinion Leadership	Urbanism	Outdoorsiness
People tell me I'm good looking (I)	.06	.29	-.02	.20	.06	-.02
A woman's place is in the home (O)	.36	-.14	.13	.15	-.31	-.16
American made is best (O)	.35	.01	.02	.01	-.03	-.01
Father should be boss in the house (O)	.38	.02	.02	.15	-.36	-.21
I'm interested in cultures of other countries (I)	-.02	.29	-.03	.01	.17	.04
We'll probably have more money next year (I)	-.03	.21	-.06	.17	.01	-.01
Most of my friends are college graduates (I)	.05	.06	-.25	.20	.28	-.01
I'll probably move in next five years (I)	-.27	.25	-.02	.15	.05	-.04
I would like to take a trip around the world (I)	-.10	.63	.09	-.06	.12	-.03
Children are the most important thing in a marriage (O)	.32	-.09	.19	.22	-.01	-.03
My greatest achievements are ahead of me (I)	-.04	.39	-.02	.10	-.09	.08

(Table B2 continued)

TABLE B2--Continued

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Factor					
	Traditionalism	Hedonism/ Optimism	Defeatism	Self-Confidence/ Opinion Leadership	Urbanism	Outdoorsiness
We have more to spend on extras than my neighbors (I)	.07	.01	-.09	.17	.01	.01
I want to rest and relax on vacation (I)	.35	.08	.18	.04	-.03	.00
I would try anything once (I)	-.09	.21	.20	.27	.12	.10
A college education is very important (O)	.26	.16	-.07	.11	.10	-.08
I am more self-confident than my friends (I)	.04	.14	.05	.46	.06	.04
Security is more important than money on a job (I)	.36	-.00	.00	-.08	-.01	.08
I spend for today (I)	.03	.04	.31	.03	.03	.08
I dread the future (I)	.19	-.19	.35	.03	.16	-.00
I am among the first to try new products (I)	.07	.13	.11	.12	.18	.16
I like to feel attractive to the opposite sex (I)	-.10	.46	.07	.19	.05	.04
I prefer to live near a big city (I)	-.03	.12	-.07	.06	.34	-.19
Friends and neighbors ask me for advice (I)	.14	.23	.03	.27	.11	.25

(Table B2 continued)

TABLE B2--Continued

Activity/interest/opinion[a]	Factor					
	Traditionalism	Hedonism/ Optimism	Defeatism	Self-Confidence/ Opinion Leadership	Urbanism	Outdoorsiness
A drink is a good way to relax (I)	-.18	.03	.25	.24	.25	-.01
I would do things differently in life (I)	.09	.11	.47	-.03	-.01	.01
I want to look different from others (I)	.03	.32	.10	.07	.14	.17
Women's Liberation is a good thing (O)	-.19	.20	.13	.04	.45	.03
I'd like to live a year in London or Paris (I)	-.09	.53	.18	.03	.26	-.05
I like to eat (I)	.07	.39	.01	.04	-.03	.08
I don't like to take chances (I)	.35	-.10	.08	-.07	.06	-.08
I would be content to live my life in this town (I)	.45	-.23	-.03	-.01	-.02	.07

[a] For specific measures, see questions 5, 21, and 30 in Appendix C.

(A) Activity.

(I) Interest.

(O) Opinion.

On the basis of its superior interpretability, the six-factor solution was selected.

The final step in the R-type factor analysis of general life styles was to develop a set of factor scores for each individual that represented this person's score on each of the six composite life-style dimensions. These factor scores were developed by least-squares regression estimates and served as the representation of the amount of each general life-style dimension possessed by each individual in further analyses.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE WITH FREQUENCY COUNTS

University of Illinois
SURVEY RESEARCH LABORATORY

Symphony and Theater Attendance Study
Selection Chart

Hello, my name is _____, and I am calling from the *(Organization)* in *(City)*. We are doing a study for the University of Illinois of how people in this area spend their leisure time. People 14 years of age or older will be interviewed in several southern communities.

1. How many people, 14 years of age or older, are currently living in this household?

   _____

2. So that we can randomly choose which household member to interview, could you please tell me, starting with the head of the household, the sex and age of each person 14 years of age or older, and their relation to the head.

Relation to Head	Sex	Age	Person No.	Check
HEAD	M F			
	M F			
	M F			
	M F			
	M F			
	M F			
	M F			

(INTERVIEWER: Starting with the oldest, number each person listed in order of age.)

Selection Number On IRF	If the number of people 14 years or older in the household is: 1	2	3	4	5	6 or more
	then select:					
1	1	1	2	2	3	3
2	1	2	3	3	3	5
3	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	1	1	1	1	2	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	2	3	4	5	5
7	1	2	2	3	4	4
8	1	1	1	2	2	2

Screener Questionnaire

1. In the past 12 months, how many times did you . .

		Mean
a.	go to a live popular or rock concert?	# 1.08
	None	965
b.	listen to classical music on radio, TV, records, or tape?	10 or more 62.58
		Less than 10 803
c.	visit an art gallery or museum?	# 1.39
	None	845
d.	go to a live classical music performance other than a symphony concert?	# 0.51
	None	1268
e.	see a ballet either live or on TV?	# 1.06
	None	848

2. Can you play a musical instrument?
   Yes 533
   No 958

3. Have you ever worked for a theater, music or dance production?
   Yes 183
   No 1308

4a. In the past 12 months, how many times did you go to see a play? [1.09] *(Skip to Q.5)*
   None 860

b. Have you attended 3 or more live plays some time in your life?
   Yes *(Skip to Q.6a)* 678
   No *(Skip to Q.6a)* 813

5. In the **past** 12 months, how many times did you go to a symphony orchestra concert? [ ] *(Skip to GREEN)*
   None *(Skip to BLUE)* 1343

[0.29]

6a. In the past 12 months, how many times did you go to a symphony orchestra concert? [ ] *(Skip to PINK)*
   None 1431

b. Have you attended 3 or more symphony concerts some time in your life?
   Yes *(Skip to WHITE)* 287
   No *(END INTERVIEW IF ALL 0'S, OTHERWISE SKIP TO WHITE)* 1204

END INTERVIEW IF ANY BOX IS 3 OR MORE AND LAST DIGIT OF PHONE # IS EVEN. ☐

Type _____

[Includes those answering on p.3]

Time interview began _____ ☐ *AM* ☐ *PM*

1. Now I would like you to think about the last time you went to a play.

a. How much did one ticket cost?

Mean: $ 4.87

Don't know 132

b. Did you or anyone in your household pay for that ticket?

Yes 448

No 171

DK 10

Not asked 862

c. Besides the ticket, how much would you say the occasion cost your household? Please include items such as babysitters, travel, parking, food, drinks, etc.

Mean: $ 15.03

Nothing (Skip to WHITE) .

Don't know 103

Not asked 862

d. How many people's expenses did this cover?

Mean: 1.97

(SKIP TO WHITE)

Time interview began _____ ☐ AM ☐ PM

[Includes those answering on p.3]

2. Now I would like you to think about the last time you went to a symphony concert.

a. How much did one ticket cost?

Mean: $ 5.38

Don't know 69

b. Did you or anyone in your household pay for that ticket?

Yes 123

No 74

DK 11

Not asked 1283

c. Besides the ticket, how much would you say the occasion cost your household? Please include items such as babysitters, travel, parking, food, drinks, etc.

Mean: $ 12.03

Nothing (Skip to WHITE) .

Don't know 32

Not asked 1283

d. How many people's expenses did this cover?

Mean: 1.77

(SKIP TO WHITE)

Time interview began _____ ☐ AM ☐ PM [For frequencies, see preceding 2 pages]

3. Now I would like you to think about the last time you went to a play.

   a. How much did one ticket cost? _____

   Don't know . . . . .

   b. Did you or anyone in your household pay for that ticket?

   Yes . . . . . .

   No . . . . . .

   c. Besides the ticket, how much would you say the occasion cost your household? Please include items such as babysitters, travel, parking, food, drinks, etc.

   $_____

   Nothing (Skip to WHITE) . .

   Don't know . . . . . .

   d. How many people's expenses did this cover? _____

4. Now I would like you to think about the last time you went to a symphony concert.

   a. How much did one ticket cost? $_____

   Don't know . . . . . .

   b. Did you or anyone in your household pay for that ticket?

   Yes . . . . . .

   No . . . . . .

   c. Besides the ticket, how much would you say the occasion cost your household? Please include items such as babysitters, travel, parking, food, drinks, etc.

   $_____

   Nothing (Skip to WHITE) . .

   Don't know . . . . . .

   d. How many people's expenses did this cover? _____

Time interview began _____ AM PM

A S K E V E R Y O N E:

5. For each of the following activities, please tell me whether it is something you do often, sometimes, seldom, or never?

		Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	DK
a.	Go bowling?	127	321	368	675	0
b.	Travel by airplane other than for business?	123	307	413	647	1
c.	Go to a sports event?	583	432	266	208	2
d.	Watch a sports event on TV?	892	344	153	101	1
e.	Give or attend a party?	484	552	324	128	3
f.	Go out to dinner at a restaurant?	804	488	153	45	1
g.	Go to a meeting of a social or service club?	281	351	405	454	0
h.	Play tennis?	178	234	246	832	1
i.	Go on a picnic?	256	616	439	178	2
j.	Work on an arts or crafts project of your own?	424	315	291	460	1
k.	Go to church or synagogue?	914	275	174	125	3
l.	Read a book for pleasure?	717	455	213	103	3
m.	See a movie in a movie theatre?	393	520	396	181	1
n.	Do yard work or gardening outdoors?	712	348	210	217	4
o.	Play golf?	72	92	167	1159	1
p.	Work on your car?	207	307	201	771	5
q.	Watch TV other than sports events?	887	412	160	31	1
r.	Go hiking?	104	308	356	723	0

6a. If you were making plans to go out in the next month, from what sources would you get information about what entertainment was available? *(Circle as many as apply)*

Newspaper ads	899
Radio	384
TV	367
Friends	727
Newspaper articles	351
Mail material	119
Posters and leaflets	128
Other *(Specify)*	103

b. Which newspapers, if any, do you read regularly?

None	124

	Very interested	Somewhat interested	Not very interested	Not at all interested	*Don't know*
7a. How interested were you in live theater when you were growing up? Would you say	286	415	478	303	9
b. How interested were your parents in live theater when you were growing up? Would you say they were	135	246	477	577	56
c. How interested were you in classical music when you were growing up? Would you say	233	386	394	467	11
d. How interested were your parents in classical music when you were growing up? Would you say they were	181	331	356	567	56

8. How much leisure time would you say you have compared to other people you know? Would you say you have . . .

Much more leisure time,	227
A little more	275
About the same,	556
A little less, or	203
A lot less?	216
Don't know	14

9. If you were to go to a live, professional play in the next month or two, how likely would it be that you would experience the following:

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	*Don't know*	Not asked
a. You could get exactly the seats you wanted? Would it be	95	185	99	66	40	1006
b. It would not take a long time to get from your home into the theater. Would it be	97	180	133	51	24	1006
c. You would feel comfortable with the audience?	222	180	50	13	20	1006
d. You would not find the play too long?	121	175	90	29	70	1006
e. You would feel personally involved with what was going on at the performance?	133	199	78	31	44	1006
f. You would find your friends there? .	63	179	127	84	32	1006
g. You would feel pleased that you were going long before the performance day?	135	205	68	38	39	1006
h. You would find the tickets inexpensive?	69	151	134	64	67	1006
i. You would not feel that it was too formal an occasion?	99	164	129	59	34	1006
j. You would find the performers excellent?	113	231	47	12	82	1006
k. You would not feel you'd spent too much for the occasion, that is, for tickets, travel, food and the like?	104	168	120	44	49	1006
l. You would like the play?	188	202	36	5	54	1006
m. You would feel you understood what was going on?	218	211	24	6	26	1006
n. You would find that those you were with were having a good time?	179	218	32	14	42	1006
o. You would learn a lot?	156	215	63	12	39	1006
p. You would not feel you were wasting your time?	152	186	73	39	35	1006
q. You would feel stimulated?	146	213	68	16	42	1006

10. We've just talked about how likely it would be to experience certain things when going to a live play. If you were to go to a live, professional play in the next month or two, how important would it be that you would experience these same things? What about . . .

	Very important	Somewhat important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant	Neutral	Don't know	Not asked
a. Being able to get exactly the seats you want? Would that be . .	5	148	84	17	222	9	1006
b. Not taking a long time to get from home into the theater? . . .	5	89	149	40	192	10	1006
c. Feeling comfortable with the audience?	6	157	89	13	211	9	1006
d. Not finding the play too long? . .	5	129	85	23	224	19	1006
e. Feeling personally involved in what's going on at the performance? . . .	6	148	66	12	237	16	1006
f. Finding your friends there? . . .	5	61	190	48	167	14	1006
g. Feeling pleased that you were going long before the performance day?	4	113	93	34	224	17	1006
h. Finding the tickets inexpensive? .	7	140	84	23	213	18	1006
i. Not feeling that it was too formal an occasion?	3	82	141	39	200	20	1006
j. Finding the performers excellent?	2	222	23	5	216	17	1006
k. Not feeling that you had spent too much for tickets, travel, food and the like?	2	155	81	22	210	15	1006
l. Liking the play?	1	286	13	2	172	11	1006
m. Feeling you understood what was going on?	0	257	16	1	198	13	1006
n. Finding that those you were with were having a good time?	1	209	26	4	234	11	1006
o. Learning alot?	2	172	60	9	228	14	1006
p. Not feeling that you were wasting your time?	0	227	35	9	201	13	1006
q. Feeling stimulated?.	3	176	37	12	242	15	1006

11. If you were to go to a symphony concert in the next month or two, how likely would it be that you would experience the following:

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't know	Not asked
a. You could get exactly the seats you wanted? Would it be	88	150	93	86	84	990
b. It would not take a long time to get from your home into the concert hall? Would it be	110	160	125	60	46	990
c. You would feel comfortable with the audience?	185	189	48	29	50	990
d. You would not find the concert too long?	102	176	99	47	77	990
e. You would feel personally involved with what was going on at the performance?	120	191	92	38	60	990
f. You would find your friends there? . .	66	158	127	99	51	990
g. You would feel pleased that you were going long before the performance day?	156	159	87	46	53	990
h. You would find the tickets inexpensive?	53	150	124	65	109	990
i. You would not feel that it was too formal an occasion?	98	153	124	58	68	990
j. You would find the performers excellent?	153	190	32	19	107	990
k. You would not feel you'd spent too much for the occasion, that is, for tickets, travel, food and the like? .	118	163	97	51	72	990
l. You would like the program?	160	192	41	29	79	990
m. You would feel you understood what was going on?	159	205	56	24	57	990
n. You would find that those you were with were having a good time?	158	208	41	28	66	990
o. You would learn a lot?	152	205	57	24	63	990
p. You would not feel you were wasting your time?	149	175	72	52	53	990
q. You would feel stimulated?	138	212	48	34	69	990

12. We've just talked about how likely it would be to experience certain things when going to a symphony concert. If you were to go to a symphony concert in the next month or two, how important would it be that you would experience these same things? What about . . .

	Very important	Somewhat important	Somewhat unimportant	Very unimportant	Neutral	Don't know	Not asked
a. Being able to get exactly the seats you want? Would it be . . .	7	137	116	31	179	31	990
b. Not taking a long time to get from home into the concert hall? Would it be	5	100	136	42	188	30	990
c. Feeling comfortable with the audience?	8	140	84	28	210	31	990
d. Not finding the concert too long?	10	144	82	27	201	37	990
e. Feeling personally involved in what's going on at the performance?	11	124	77	18	234	37	990
f. Finding your friends there? . . .	6	72	183	64	143	33	990
g. Feeling pleased that you were going long before the performance day? .	9	113	91	43	207	38	990
h. Finding the tickets inexpensive? .	4	157	85	39	179	37	990
i. Not feeling that it was too formal an occasion?	5	88	143	46	181	38	990
j. Finding the performers excellent?	6	220	36	11	189	39	990
k. Not feeling that you had spent too much for the occasion, that is, for tickets, travel, food and the like?	5	135	91	27	206	37	990
l. Liking the program?	3	267	24	11	160	36	990
m. Feeling you understood what was going on?	3	228	27	9	201	33	990
n. Finding that those you were with were having a good time?	2	174	35	11	243	36	990
o. Learning a lot?	9	155	64	14	226	33	990
p. Not feeling that you were wasting your time?	3	208	38	13	205	34	990
q. Feeling stimulated?	5	156	46	11	241	42	990

13a. How likely do you think you are to attend a symphony concert in the next year or two? Would you say . . .

Very likely	419
Somewhat likely	641
Not very likely, or *(Skip to Q.21)* .	248
Not at all likely? *(Skip to Q.21)* . .	181

b. About how much would you expect to pay for a ticket to a _____ symphony orchestra concert?

Mean:
$ 8.23

Don't know 90

c. How would you describe the quality of a typical _____ symphony concert? Would you say it is . . .

Excellent, ...	2
Good, ...	29
Fair, or	209
Poor?	130
Don't know	61
Not asked	1060

d. About how many minutes does it take to get from your home to _____?

Mean:
49.18 minutes

Dont' know 11

Now I'm going to suggest some different kinds of symphony offerings for you to react to.

	Much more often	Somewhat more often	As often	Less often	DK	Not asked
14a. Suppose that next year unsold tickets for performances of the _____ Symphony could be obtained at regular ticket outlets for 50% off on the day of the performance. The seats usually would not be as good as those bought in advance. Would you go much more often, somewhat more often, as often, or less often than you do now?	56	181	151	30	13	1060
b. Suppose that symphony performances were given five times a year in a location nearer your home. The performing space wouldn't be as nice as _____ but the prices would be 20% lower. Would you go much more often, somewhat more often, as often, or less often than you do now?	57	164	149	50	11	1060
15. Now, would you go much more often, somewhat more often, or less often than you do now . . .						
(a) If tickets could be purchased by telephone and charged to a national or department store credit card?	54	105	224	33	15	1060
(b) If there was a short introductory talk about the music by the conductor before the performance?	66	141	192	16	16	1060
(c) If after purchasing one ticket at regular price you could get a second ticket at 50% off?	127	174	108	7	15	1060
(d) If you knew that people were dressing more informally at the concert?	50	116	234	19	12	1060
(e) If guest conductors and famous soloists appeared with the orchestra more frequently?	87	200	126	7	11	1060

16a. Do you currently subscribe to series tickets for symphony performances?

Yes (Skip to Q.16c)	31
No	400
Not asked	1060

b. If you could get series tickets guaranteeing good seats for several symphony performances, would you purchase such a series if there was a . . . *(Repeat until "Yes", then circle)*

10% discount?	Yes	123
20% discount?	Yes	42
30% discount?	Yes	57
	No	174
	DK	4
	Not asked	1091

c. If you could get series tickets which guaranteed good seats for several symphony performances but there was no price discount, would you purchase such a series ticket?

Yes	127
No	202
Don't know	102
Not asked	1060

17a. Would you attend <u>more</u> symphony concerts than you do now if individual ticket prices were . . . *(Repeat until "Yes", then circle)*

Reduced by $1?	Yes	122
Reduced by $2?	Yes	65
Reduced by $3?	Yes	79
	No	158
	DK	7
	Not asked	1060

b. Would you attend <u>fewer</u> concerts than you do now if individual ticket prices were . . . *(Repeat until "Yes", then circle)*

Increased by $1?	Yes . . .	120
Increased by $2?	Yes . . .	65
Increased by $3?	Yes . . .	44
	No . . .	200
	DK	2
	Not asked	1060

18. If the symphony concerts were to include more of the following kinds of music, would you be likely to go much more often, somewhat more often, as often or less often than you do now? What about . . .

	Much more often	Somewhat more often	As often	Less often	*Don't know*	Not asked
a. Symphonies by classical composers like Mozart and Beethoven	68	144	163	42	14	1060
b. Symphonies by romantic composers like Brahms and Tchaikovsky	58	152	155	50	16	1060
c. Music by contemporary composers like Stravinsky	44	110	165	81	31	1060
d. Concertos with soloists	45	119	162	83	22	1060
e. Choral music	51	109	139	115	17	1060

19. Of these five types of music, which is your most favorite? *(Read)*

Classical symphonies, ...	138
Romantic symphonies, ...	82
Contemporary classical music, . .	80
Concertos, ...	15
Choral music, or	66
Some other type of music? *(Specify)*	28
Don't know (Skip to Q.21) . . .	22
Not asked	1060

20. Let's suppose that your favorite kind of music were presented more often during the year, but ticket prices were raised. Would you go to the symphony less frequently than you do now if ticket prices were . . . *(Repeat until "Yes", then circle)*

Increased by $1?	Yes . . .	126
Increased by $2?	Yes . . .	42
Increased by $3?	Yes . . .	51
	No . . .	191
	DK	2
	Not asked	1079

21. Please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements.

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK
(1)	I have more spare time than I need	66	260	788	374	3
(2)	If cultural organizations cannot pay their own way, they should go out of business	32	375	881	152	51
(3)	I like to attend sporting events	407	811	232	37	4
(4)	I have somewhat old fashioned tastes and habits	161	866	404	48	12
(5)	I like to be considered a leader	119	728	607	25	12
(6)	Many of my friends are interested in the theater	38	476	838	119	20
(7)	I wish I could leave my present life and do something entirely different	87	398	813	175	18
(8)	Our family is a close knit group	385	957	118	26	5
(9)	My days seem to follow a definite routine--eating meals at the same time each day, etc	130	646	596	115	4
(10)	Shopping is no fun	99	446	791	147	8
(11)	The schools in this area provide adequate opportunity for children to participate in the arts and cultural activities	78	790	338	76	209
(12)	I often wish for the good old days	125	556	731	68	11
(13)	I usually know which plays are being performed around here	43	580	767	97	4
(14)	I work under a great deal of pressure most of the time	94	493	808	94	2
(15)	I watch TV in order to quietly relax	119	768	541	58	5
(16)	Everything is changing too fast these days	109	660	667	36	19
(17)	People tell me I am good looking	66	878	508	19	20
(18)	Every home with children should have a complete set of encyclopedias	255	1059	163	5	9
(19)	A woman's place is in the home	98	486	749	133	25
(20)	I enjoy jazz music	157	864	432	34	4

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK
(21)	I'd rather read a good book than a newspaper	168	706	581	20	16
(22)	American made is the best made	95	782	552	19	43
(23)	The father should be the boss in the house	160	770	495	51	15
(24)	I enjoy many foreign films	26	511	884	58	12
(25)	I am interested in the cultures of other countries	131	1021	312	21	6
(26)	I will probably have more money to spend next year than I do now	118	839	454	40	40
(27)	People who are important to me think I should go to classical symphony concerts	14	219	1064	182	12
(28)	Most of my friends have graduated from college	71	693	665	49	13
(29)	I will probably move at least once in the next five years	127	689	572	81	22
(30)	I would like to take a trip around the world	373	739	345	33	1
(31)	I'd pay extra for high quality television programming	107	82[illegible]	515	33	11
(32)	Children are the most important thing in a marriage	95	567	745	67	17
(33)	My greatest achievements are ahead of me	162	949	346	10	24
(34)	We have more to spend on extras than most of our neighbors	29	491	880	46	45
(35)	On a vacation, I just want to rest and relax	126	741	582	39	3
(36)	The arts are more important to me than to most other people	55	435	947	49	5
(37)	I am the kind of person who would try anything once	114	725	596	41	15

22a. How likely do you think you are to attend a live professional theater performance in the next year or two? Would you say . . .

Very likely, ...	280
Somewhat likely, ...	554
Not very likely, or *(Skip to Q.30)* . .	325
Not at all likely? *(Skip to Q.30)* . .	331
DK	1

b. About how much would you expect to pay for a ticket to a theater performance at _____?

Mean:
$ 7.67

Don't know 146

c. How would you describe the quality of a typical performance there? Would you say it is . . .

Excellent, ...	3
Good, ...	58
Fair, or	338
Poor?	153
Don't know	105
Not asked	834

d. About how many minutes does it take to get from your home to _____?

Mean:
22.10 minutes

Don't know 28

Now I'm going to suggest some different kinds of theater offerings for you to react to.

	Much more often	Somewhat more often	As often	Less often	DK	Not asked
23a. Suppose that next year unsold tickets for theater performances could be obtained at regular ticket outlets for 50% off on the day of the performance. The seats usually would not be as good as those bought in advance. Would you go much more often, somewhat more often, as often or less often than you do now?	104	243	250	55	5	834
b. Suppose that theater performances were given five times a year in a location nearer your home. The performing space wouldn't be as nice as _____ but the prices would be 20% lower. Would you go much more often, somewhat more often, as often, or less often than you do now?	75	224	289	62	7	834
24. Now, would you go more often, as often, or less often than you do now . . .						
(a) If theater tickets could be purchased by telephone and charged to a national or department store credit card?	76	150	360	69	2	834
(b) If there was a short discussion of the play by the director after the performance? .	51	171	376	52	7	834
(c) If after purchasing one ticket at regular price you could get a second ticket at 50% off?	142	302	190	15	8	834
(d) If you knew that people were dressing more informally at the theater?	65	149	413	26	4	834
(e) If famous actors and actresses appeared with the company more frequently?	145	279	215	16	2	834

25a. Do you currently subscribe to series tickets for the theater?

Yes *(Skip to Q.25c)* . . .	46
No	610
DK	1
Not asked	834

b. If you could get series tickets guaranteeing good seats for several plays would you purchase such a series if there was a . . .
(Repeat until "Yes", then circle)

10% discount?	Yes	185
20% discount?	Yes	58
30% discount?	Yes	92
	No	275
	DK	5
	Not asked	876

c. If you could get series tickets which guaranteed good seats for several plays but there was no price discount, would you purchase such a series ticket?

Yes	178
No	309
Don't know	170
Not asked	834

26a. Would you attend more plays than you do now if ticket prices were . . .
(Repeat until "Yes", then circle)

Reduced by $1?	Yes	151
Reduced by $2?	Yes	89
Reduced by $3?	Yes	130
	No	281
	DK	6
	Not asked	834

b. Would you attend fewer plays than you do now if ticket prices were . . .
(Repeat until "Yes", then circle)

Increased by $1?	Yes . . .	145
Increased by $2?	Yes . . .	77
Increased by $3?	Yes . . .	73
	No . . .	358
	DK	4
	Not asked	834

27. If the theater offerings were to include more of the following kinds of plays, would you be likely to go much more often, somewhat more often, as often, or less often than you do now? How about . . .

	Much more often	Somewhat more often	As often	Less often	*Don't know*	Not asked
a. Musical comedies like "South Pacific" or "Show Boat"?	173	229	165	79	11	834
b. Classical plays like "Hamlet" or "Macbeth"?	76	150--	205	214	12	834
c. Well known American dramas like "Death of a Salesman" or "A Streetcar Named Desire"?	114	244	201	86	12	834
d. Modern comedies like "The Sunshine Boys"?	126	234	187	94	13	834
e. Original plays that have never been done before?	70	165	224	171	26	834

28. Of these five types of theater offerings, which is your most favorite? *(Read)*

Musical comedies, ...	268
Classical plays, ...	59
Well-known American dramas, ...	120
Modern comedies, ...	113
Original plays, or	61
Some other type of theater offering? *(Specify)*	9
Don't know (Skip to Q. 30)	27
Not asked	834

29. Let's suppose that your favorite kind of play were presented more often during the year, but ticket prices were raised. Would you go to the theatre less frequently than you do now if prices were . . .

Increased by $1?	Yes . . .	144
Increased by $2?	Yes . . .	79
Increased by $3?	Yes . . .	86
	No . . .	324
	DK	6
	Not asked	852

30. For each of the following statements, please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	*Don't know*
(1) Television is my primary source of entertainment. Do you	126	478	676	193	18
(2) A college education is very important for success in today's world. Do you . .	320	747	358	33	33
(3) I would rather spend a quiet evening at home than go to a party	107	736	533	55	60
(4) I like adventure movies	111	1104	243	11	22
(5) I am more self-confident than most of my friends are	94	779	535	12	71
(6) Most of the arts and cultural activities in this area are not for someone like me	35	461	869	54	72
(7) I am a home body	91	710	617	56	17
(8) On a job, security is more important than money	74	868	423	36	90
(9) My major hobby is my family	127	848	467	21	28
(10) I pretty much spend for today and let tomorrow take care of itself	65	540	792	75	19
(11) I do more things socially than most of my friends do	32	450	936	46	27
(12) I dread the future	20	136	1080	226	29
(13) I like to read nonfiction books	73	956	413	25	24
(14) Many of my friends are interested in symphony concerts	19	312	930	176	54
(15) I don't often listen to the radio	38	268	925	245	15
(16) I usually know which symphony concerts are being performed around here	31	408	847	187	18
(17) I am usually among the first to try new products	29	548	839	42	33
(18) People who are important to me think I should go to live plays	19	267	1031	125	49

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	*Don't know*
(19) I like to feel attractive to people of the opposite sex	213	1047	191	7	33
(20) I can't see myself going to an opera	93	507	797	75	19
(21) I often seek out the advice of my friends regarding brands and products	38	861	551	22	19
(22) I would rather live near a big city than in or near a small town	92	673	614	69	43
(23) My friends and neighbors often come to me for advice	91	952	423	6	19
(24) I glance at most of the pages of the daily newspaper	138	1050	260	30	13
(25) A drink or two at the end of a long day is a good way to relax	50	461	795	151	34
(26) If I had my life to live over I would do things differently	81	607	697	75	31
(27) I want to look a little different from others	63	921	460	12	35
(28) I go to some movies to see certain actors or actresses	51	834	544	39	23
(29) I think Women's Liberation is a good thing	80	766	479	78	88
(30) I would like to spend a year in London or Paris	223	566	603	66	33
(31) I like to eat	402	943	128	1	17
(32) I don't like to take chances	63	695	661	48	24
(33) I would be content to live in the same town the rest of my life	90	784	496	88	33

Now, I'd like to ask you a few background questions.

31. For how many years have you lived in the _____ area?

Mean: 19.71 years
DK/NA 3

32a. Are there any children under the age of 14 living in this household?

Yes 650
No *(Skip to Q.33)* 840
DK/NA 1

b. How many are under 6 years of age? Mean: 0.32

c. How many are 6 to 13 years? 0.43

DK/NA 12

33. How many automobiles does your household own? 1.80

34. What is the highest grade or year of school you have completed?

None 0
Elementary 96
High school 658
College 592
Some graduate school 70
Graduate or professional degree 72
DK 2
Not asked 1

35a. Are you presently . . .

Employed full-time, ... 715
Employed part-time, ... 147
Temporarily out of work, ... 64
Retired, or 112
Not usually employed? *(Skip to Q. 36)* 203
Keeping house/homemaker (Skip to Q. 36) 205
Other (Specify) (Skip to Q. 36) 37
DK/NA 8

(If "Retired" or "Temporarily out of work" ask about last occupation)

b. What is (was) your main occupation or job title?

_____

c. What kind of work do (did) you do, that is, what are (were) your duties on this job?

_____

d. In what type of business or industry is (was) this, that is, what product is (was) made or what service is (was) given?

36. Are you the head of this household?

Yes *(Skip to Q.39a)* . .	719
No	771
DK/NA	1

37. What is the highest grade or year of school completed by the head of this household?

None	0
Elementary	
High school	395
College	279
Some graduate school	25
Graduate or professional degree	20
DK	1
Not asked	719

38.. Is the head of the household presently . . .

Employed full-time, ...	628
Employed part-time, ...	19
Temporarily out of work, ...	14
Retired, or	69
Not usually employed? *(Skip to Q.39a)*	20
Keeping house/homemaker (Skip to Q.39a)	11
Other (Specify) (Skip to Q.39a)	4
DK	7
Not asked	719

(If "Retired" or "Temporarily out of work" ask about last occupation.)

b. What is (was) the main occupation or job title of the head of the household?

_____

c. What kind of work does (did) he/she do, that is, what are (were) his/her duties on this job?

_____

d. In what type of business or industry is (was) this, that is, what product is (was) made or what service is (was) given?

_____

39a. What is the highest grade or year of school your father completed?

None	12
Elementary	254
High school	429
College	247
Some graduate school	16
Graduate or professional degree	63
Father is head	118
Don't know	325
Not applicable	27

b. What is the highest grade or year of school your mother completed?

None	10
Elementary	208
High school	648
College	257
Some graduate school	16
Graduate or professional degree	26
Mother is head	29
Don't know	272
Not applicable	25

40a. What is your marital status? Are you . . .

Married,	859
Separated, *(Skip to Q.41)*	45
Divorced, *(Skip to Q.41)*	88
Widowed, or *(Skip to Q.41)*	124
Never married? *(Skip to Q.41)*	374
DK/NA	1

b. Is your spouse employed?

Yes	620
No	234
DK/NA	5
Not asked	632

41. What is your racial background? *(Don't read categories unless "R" does not understand.)*

White/Caucasian	1143
Black/Negro/African-American	302
Oriental/Asian-American	4
Mexican-American/Puerto-Rican/Latin American	4
American Indian/Native-American	6
Other *(Specify)* _____	3
	NA 29

42. Considering all of the income from employment and from all other sources of everyone in your household, was your total household income before taxes last year, 1976 . . . *(Repeat until "No" then circle)*

More than $7,000? No	253
More than $10,000? No	153
More than $12,000? No	113
More than $15,000? No	188
More than $20,000? No	161
More than $25,000? No	157
More than $50,000? No	101
Yes	19
Don't know	211
Would not state income	135

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Time interview ended _____ []*AM* []*PM*

#14 or over Mean: 2.27

Head: Sex M 1155 F 335 NA 1

Age Mean: 36.00

R: Sex ____

Age ____

Coder

K.P. ____

REFERENCES

1. Andreasen, Alan R. "Potential Marketing Applications of Longitudinal Methods," in Peter D. Bennett, ed., *Marketing and Economic Development*. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1965, 261-75.

2. Baumol, William and Hilda Baumol. *Last Minute Discounts on Unsold Tickets: A Study of TKTS*. New York: Theater Development Fund, 1974.

3. Burger, Philip C. and Barbara Schott. "Can Private Brand Buyers Be Identified?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (May 1972), 219-22.

4. Darden, William R. and Fred D. Reynolds. "Predicting Opinion Leadership for Men's Apparel Fashions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (August 1972), 324-28.

5. DiMaggio, Paul, Michael Useem, and Paula Brown. *The American Arts Audience: Its Study and Its Character*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for the Study of Public Policy, 1977.

6. Fishbein, Martin and Icek Ajzen. *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

7. Frank, Ronald, William Massy, and Yoram Wind. *Market Segmentation*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

8. Good, Walter S. and Ho Suchsland. "Consumer Life Styles and Their Relationships to Market Behavior Regarding Household Furniture," *Michigan State University Research Bulletin*, No. 26 (1970).

9. Hughes, G. David. "Distinguishing Salience and Valence." Paper presented at the Attitude Research Workshop, University of Illinois, 1970.

10. King, Charles W. and George B. Sproles. "The Explanatory Efficiency of Selected Types of Consumer Profile Variables in Fashion Change Agent Identification." Paper No. 475, Institute for Research in the Behavioral, Economic, and Management Sciences, Krannert Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Purdue University, 1973.

11. Lansing, John B. and Leslie Kish. "Family Life Cycle as an Independent Variable," *American Sociological Review*, 22 (October 1957), 512-19.

12. Lehmann, Donald K. "Television Show Preference: Application of a Choice Model," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8 (February 1971), 47-55.

13. Eric Marder Associates, Inc. *The Finances of the Performing Arts*. New York: Ford Foundation, 1974.

14. May, Eleanor G. "Psychographics in Department Store Imagery." Working paper P-65, Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge, Mass., 1971.

15. McCarthy, E. Jerome. *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach*. (4th ed.) Homewood, Ill.: Irwin, 1971

16. National Endowment for the Arts. Research Division Program Solicitation, February 4, 1976.

17. National Research Center of the Arts, Inc. *Americans and the Arts*. New York: National Committee for Cultural Resources, 1976.

18. Newman, Danny. *Subscribe Now!* New York: Theater Communications Group, 1977.

19. Nie, Norman et al. *SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

20. Pessemier, Edgar A. and Douglas J. Tigert. "A Taxonomy of Magazine Readership Applied to Problems in Marketing Strategy and Media Selection." Institute Paper No. 195, Institute for Research in the Behavioral, Economic, and Management Sciences, Krannert Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Purdue University, 1967.

21. Plummer, Joseph T. "Life Style Patterns and Commercial Bank Credit Card Usage," *Journal of Marketing*, 35 (April 1971), 35-41.

22. ———. "Life Style Patterns: A New Constraint for Mass Communication Research," *Journal of Broadcasting*, 16 (Winter 1971-72), 79-89.

23. Rosenberg, Milton J. "Cognitive Structure and Attitudinal Affect," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 53 (November 1956), 367-72.